
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
3 1761 00379547 3

Sacred Books of the Buddhists, Vol. X.

THE BOOK OF THE DISCIPLINE

VOLUME I.

THE BOOK OF THE DISCIPLINE

(VINAYA-PIṬAKA)

VOL. I.

(SUTTAVIBHAṄGA)

TRANSLATED BY

I. B. HORNER, M.A.

ASSOCIATE OF NEWNHAM COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

PUBLISHED FOR THE PALI TEXT SOCIETY

by

LUZAC & COMPANY LTD.

46 GREAT RUSSELL STREET, LONDON, W.C.1

1949

First published - 1938
By The Oxford University Press

Printed in Great Britain

TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

The present translation of the Vinaya-Piṭaka is based upon Hermann Oldenberg's extremely careful edition of the Pali text of the Vinaya-Piṭaka, published in five volumes in the years 1879-1883. In the Introduction to Vol. I. of his edition, Oldenberg wrote (p. x) that he had been compelled to relinquish his original intention of adding a complete translation to the text. But in the years 1881, 1882, 1885 T. W. Rhys Davids and Oldenberg collaborated in the production of a partial translation, called *Vinaya Texts*, published in the *Sacred Books of the East Series* (Vols. XIII., XVII., XX.) in three volumes.

The detailed handling, exposition and analysis of many important, interesting, difficult and obscure points make of *Vinaya Texts* a work of remarkable scholarship. In addition, the erudition of one who had had opportunities of investigating contemporary monasticism in Ceylon has been bestowed upon it. Indeed, Rhys Davids' and Oldenberg's translation can admit of supplement in only two respects, while in all others I am aware that my attempt at a critical translation compares but unfavourably with theirs.

In the first place, .what is now needed, both for its own sake and in order to bring the Vinaya into line with, at least, the Sutta-Piṭaka, is a complete, as against a partial translation into English. This is one of the two respects in which *Vinaya Texts* can be supplemented. Secondly, our knowledge of various aspects of Buddhism has doubtless increased during the fifty-two years which separate the appearance of Vol. III. of *Vinaya Texts* and the appearance of Vol. I. of *The Book of the Discipline.* During this time the Pali Text Society has been founded, and has published all the Pali Canonical "books," practically all the Com-

mentaries and other post-Canonical "books," together with a considerable number of translations, not to mention a Dictionary.

This mass of material, not available to the original translators of the Vinaya, has made possible a comparison of passages, phrases and words occurring in scattered parts of the Canon, so that now a more definite and perhaps less tentative interpretation of the significance of some of them, as they appear in the Vinaya, can be presented. This is the second way in which *Vinaya Texts* can be supplemented. It is only by discovering what words and phrases signify in passages other than those with which one is at the moment concerned, that the general, and even the exceptional, meaning of those same words and phrases can be more or less accurately gauged. I have considered it desirable, in the light of the knowledge made accessible during the last fifty years by the issues of the Pali Text Society and certain books on Early Buddhism, to revise and remould some of the renderings in *Vinaya Texts*. Even so, one cannot fail to be impressed by the vision of the original translators, whose interpretations, sometimes no more than leaps in the dark, have often proved successful and unimpeachable.

There is reason to suspect that some words and phrases are peculiar to the Vinaya, or have a special connotation in it, but there can be no certainty upon this point, until the Concordance, which is being compiled under the auspices of Mrs. Rhys Davids, is brought to completion.

Since the study of Early Buddhism is admittedly still in its infancy, many of the rich and variegated treasures of its storehouse as yet await investigation. Hence, I am fully aware that *The Book of the Discipline* is nothing more than an interim translation, needed for the reasons given above, but in no way claiming to be final and definitive.

The word *vinaya* has come to be paired, as it were (although since precisely when we do not know), with

the word *dhamma*. This is a word whose long history needs a detailed study, such as we have in W. Geiger's *Dhamma*, 1920, while *vinaya* is considerably easier of definition. Whatever the exact meaning or meanings of *dhamma* may have been at one stage in the history of Early Buddhism or at another, or at one part of the Sayings or at another, it is a fair enough description to say that *dhamma* concerned the inner life of Gotama's followers, their conscience, their mental training and outlook and, later, stood for the body of teaching that they were to believe and follow; and that *vinaya* was the discipline governing and regulating the outward life of the monks and nuns who had entered the monastic Orders, the foundation of which is attributed to Gotama. *Dhamma* may indeed be said to be all that *vinaya* is not.[1] Two Piṭakas are devoted to *dhamma*: the Sutta-Piṭaka and the (later) Abhidhamma-Piṭaka; one, the Vinaya-Piṭaka, as its name implies, to *vinaya*.[2]

I have called the present translation *The Book of the Discipline*, rather than *The Basket (Piṭaka) of the Discipline*, on the analogy of *The Book (Nikāya) of the Kindred Sayings* and *The Book of the Gradual Sayings*. What was originally an oral tradition of Sayings became, at some time, committed to palm-leaf manuscripts. Later still, these were "edited" to form the material of printed books. Today the early Sayings survive nowhere but in books.

Oldenberg began his edition of the text of the Vinaya-Piṭaka with the section known as the Mahāvagga. This, together with the Cūḷavagga to which he proceeded, constitutes the Khandhakas. He placed the Suttavibhaṅga after these, and ended with the admittedly later Parivāra. But properly speaking, the Pali Vinaya begins with the Suttavibhaṅga. The

[1] Oldenberg, *Vin.* i: xiii.

[2] For chronology of the Pali Canon, see B. C. Law, *History of Pali Literature*, Chapter I.

Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin school "follows the same general arrangement,"[1] as do apparently the Chinese Vinaya of the Mahīsāsaka school and the Dulva, or Tibetan Vinaya of the Mahāsarvāstivādins.[2] Be this as it may, the Pali Vinaya is the only one with which we can concern ourselves here. Comparisons with the Vinaya of other schools must be left to one side, as must comparisons with the rules and discipline of pre-Sakyan sects and contemporary sects, including the Jain Orders of monks and nuns.[3]

According to Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, the oldest portion of the Vinaya is the Pātimokkha, or list of 227 rules,[4] or courses of training to be observed. As this seems to be indisputably the case, it is only fitting that the Suttavibhaṅga should precede the Khandhakas. For the Suttavibhaṅga is that portion of the Vinaya which contains the Pātimokkha.

In their *Vinaya Texts*, Rhys Davids and Oldenberg open with the Pātimokkha. Buddhaghosa in his Commentary, the Samantapāsādikā (denoted as *VA.* in the footnotes to my translation),[5] begins with the Suttavibhaṅga *in extenso*. I therefore follow the same plan, and mention it chiefly to indicate that my Vol. I. does not correspond to Oldenberg's Vol. I., but approximately to the first two-thirds of his Vol. III. Considerations of length alone prevented me from including all his Vol. III. in my Vol. I. of *The Book of the Discipline*. On the other hand, this present volume corresponds to the opening portion of Vol. I. of *Vinaya Texts*. The chief difference between the presentation of the Suttavibhaṅga in *Vinaya Texts* and *The Book*

---

[1] E. J. Thomas, *Hist. of Buddhist Thought*, p. 267; but see N. Dutt, *Early History of the Spread of Buddhism*, p. 283 f.

[2] Oldenberg, *Vin.* i. xliv ff.

[3] See Jacobi, *Jaina Sūtras*, i. xix ff. (*S.B.E.* xxii.).

[4] See S. Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p. 92, and B. C. Law, *Hist. of Pali Lit.*, i. 20 f., for notes on variant numbers of the rules. Also Winternitz, *Hist. of Ind. Lit.*, ii. 23, n. 5, for numbers of rules recognised by various schools.

[5] *I.e.*, *Vinaya-aṭṭhakathā*, Commentary on the Vinaya.

of the Discipline is that, in the former the Suttavibhaṅga is cut down to comprise nothing more than the Pātimokkha rules themselves, all auxiliary material being omitted, while the latter, when finished, will contain, with very few exceptions,[1] an unabridged translation of the entire Suttavibhaṅga.

The Vinaya, the Discipline, especially that portion of it called Suttavibhaṅga, appoints and decrees a definite standard of outward morality, comprised in courses of training laid down for the proper behaviour of monks and nuns. On the surface the Suttavibhaṅga is not much more than an attempt to restrain unsuitable behaviour; but in reality it also arrives, though in many cases by a long process of exclusion, at the kind of positive conduct to be pursued by the monk who wishes his life to be externally blameless, so far as his relations with his fellow monks, with the Order as a whole, and with the laity are concerned.

This limitation of the Suttavibhaṅga to an outward and objective field is amply indicated by the striking absence from it, of any passage stating that the observance of the courses of training " made known for monks by the lord " will conduce to the realisation of desirable subjective states. The gulf between this and the pre-eminently subjective attitude of the Sutta-Piṭaka is immense. Never once is it said, in the Suttavibhaṅga, that the courses of training should be followed so as to lead, for example, to the rejection of passion, of hatred, of confusion, to the destruction of the *āsavas* (cankers), to making the Way (one, fourfold, eightfold) become, to the mastery of *dhamma*, to the attainment of perfection. Always the recurrent formula of the Suttavibhaṅga declares that breaches of a course of training are " not fitting, not suitable, not worthy of a recluse, not to be done," and so on, and that such lapses are not " for the benefit of non-believers nor for increase in the number of believers." Thus a standard of conduct is imposed from outside, and for

[1] See below, p. xxxvii.

external, impersonal reasons, instead of insistence being laid, as in the Nikāya teaching, on the great subjective states attainable through a man's own efforts of will.

The word *Suttavibhaṅga* means analysis or classification (*vibhaṅga*) of a *sutta*, a term here applied to each rule or course of training included in the Pātimokkha. The literal meaning of *sutta* (*sūtra*) is of course string or thread, and as such also appears in the Vinaya. But its meaning of rule or clause or article is apparently peculiar to this composition, and is, according to Dr. E. J. Thomas,[1] earlier than its meaning of separate discourse. That the word *sutta*, in the Vinaya, probably does bear the meaning of rule, as was suggested in *Vinaya Texts*,[2] is indicated by various passages. For example, at *Vin.* i. 65=68, a monk is not to receive the upasampadā ordination if he does not know the two Pātimokkhas[3] rule by rule (*suttato*); at *Vin.* ii. 68, it is said: "This thing is in a rule (*suttâgata*) and comes up for recitation every half-month."[4] The thing (*dhamma*) here referred to is not in a Sutta, or Sutta-Piṭaka discourse, but does occur, as part of a course of training, in the Vinaya. Further, the Vinaya Commentary mentions, calling it a *sutta*,[5] the statement allowing an *ārāma* (park) to monks. The one reference that I have come across to the compound *suttavibhaṅga* in the Vinaya text[6] (apart from its use as the title of the section bearing its name) is in association with *sutta*. Both these terms appear here to refer as clearly to Vinaya and not to Sutta-Piṭaka material, as do the others cited above.

As the Suttavibhaṅga has come down to us,[7] it is divided into two sections: Pārājika and Pācittiya. Between them, these two sections comprise 227 rules divided into the eight groups of the four Pārājikas,

---

[1] *History of Buddhist Thought*, p. 268, n. 2. [2] Vol. i. xxviii f.
[3] The one for the monks and the one for the nuns.
[4] See below, p. xi. [5] *VA*. 81. [6] *Vin*. ii. 97.
[7] For date of compilation of the Suttavibhaṅga see *Vin. Texts*, i. xxi.

the thirteen Saṅghâdisesas, the two Aniyatas, the thirty Nissaggiya Pācittiyas, the ninety-two Pācittiyas, the four Pāṭidesaniyas, the seventy-five Sekhiyas, and the Adhikaraṇasamatha rules.[1] Only the first three groups are contained in Vol. I. of *The Book of the Discipline.* There is a corresponding Bhikkhunī-vibhaṅga, sometimes referred to as the Bhikkhunī-vinaya, or Discipline for nuns, with its set of Pātimokkha rules. This will appear in a later volume of this translation.

The Suttavibhaṅga material is usually arranged in a series of four groups: (1) a story leading up to a rule; (2) a Pātimokkha rule, which always states the penalty incurred for breaking it; (3) the Old Commentary, the Padabhājaniya, on each rule, defining it word by word; (4) more stories telling of deviations from the rule, and showing either that they were not so grave as to entail the maximum penalty, or that they were reasonable enough to warrant, in certain circumstances, a modification or a relaxation of the existing rule, or that they were not such as to be rendered permissible by any extenuating circumstances. Items (3) and (4) are sometimes reversed in position, and (4) is now and again absent altogether.

The Pātimokkha rules are the core of the Suttàvibhaṅga. This list of rules, or list of courses of training, was recited twice a month on the *uposatha* (observance, sabbath, or avowal) days, held on the nights of the new and the full moon.[2] In Vedic times, the *upavasatha* was a fast day kept for the preparation of and the performance of the Soma sacrifice. According to the Pali tradition, *paribbājakas*, or wanderers belonging to other sects, also held sacred two, if not three, days in each month for the recitation of their dhamma.[3] It was in imitation of this popular custom that the Sakyan bhikkhus assembled on these same three days. Later, apparently, these were reduced to two,[4] and were devoted to the recitation of the Pātimokkha rules.

[1] *Cf.* B. C. Law, *Hist. of Pali Lit.*, i. 46 f.
[2] *Vin.* i. 104.
[3] *Vin.* i. 101.
[4] *Vin.* i. 104.

This recitation served the double purpose of keeping the rules fresh in the minds of the monks and nuns, and of giving each member of the monastic community the opportunity, while the rules were being repeated or recited,[1] to avow any offences that he or she had committed. After the avowal came the due punishment. In the Suttavibhaṅga, the monk is usually shown as avowing his offence to Gotama, or to one of the monks, or to a group of monks, directly he had committed it, and not as waiting to avow it before the full congregation (*saṅgha*) of monks. He was thus "pure" for the *uposatha* ceremony, and could take his place at the meeting.

Oldenberg sees in the term *pātimokkha*, freedom "from sins there named,"[2] that is, in the list of rules called Pātimokkha. This is part of what amounted in Oldenberg to an obsession with "the doctrine regarding release from suffering, which forms so central an idea in the ancient Buddhist faith."[3] But the monks were not asked, as Oldenberg states, whether they were "free from the sins there named." The word for "free" or "freed" would have been *vimutta*. What they were asked was whether they were *parisuddha*, quite pure, pure in the matter of having kept the rules, therefore outwardly pure. I think that if Oldenberg had looked upon the Pātimokkha as a list of rules or courses of training, as I have called them above, and not as a "list of those offences which deserved punishment or some kind of expiation,"[4] he would not have been so much dominated by the idea of freedom from "sins." Moreover, "sin" is not even a Sakyan conception.

This is leading us up to the derivation of the word *pāti-* (*pāṭi-*) *mokkha*. Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, following Childers, refer it to *pāṭi* (Skrt., *prati*) + *muc*, and see in it "disburdening, getting free."[5] Buddhaghosa, too, at Vism. 16, derives it from *muc*, in the

[1] Not "read out," as Oldenberg says, *Vin.* i. xv.
[2] *Vin.* i. xv. [3] *Ibid.*, xiv. [4] *Ibid.*, xv.
[5] *Vin. Texts*, i. xxvii f.

sense of being free from the punishments of *niraya* (hell) and other painful rebirths. But it was not the getting free that was of such importance as the being bound. This came first. Preceding the notion, if indeed it ever existed at the time when the Vinaya was compiled, that the monk should be free of sin or of the punishment for sin, came the assumption that the rules, as binding, should be followed and obeyed, and that a monk should be "bound by the restraint of the Pātimokkha" (*pātimokkhasaṃvarasaṃvuta*).

S. Dutt is of the opinion that *pātimokkha* means "bond." He regards it as an external bond of union devised to convert the *Sect* of the *Sakyaputtiya samaṇas* into an *Order*.[1] Rhys Davids and Stede in the *P.E.D.* say that it has the "sense of binding, obligatory, obligation," and that the Sanskrit adaptation of the Pali should be *pratimokṣya*, "that which should be made binding," and not *prātimokṣa*. *Pratimokṣya*, according to these lexicographers, is the same as the Pali *pātimokkha*, "binding, obligatory," from *paṭimuñcati*, to fasten, to bind.[2]

Dr. E. J. Thomas, on the other hand, says that *pātimokkha* is "in Sanskrit *prātimoksha*. In form it is an adjective formed from *patimokkha*, binding, from *pati-muc-* 'to fasten or bind on (as armour),' and thus should mean 'that which binds, obligatory,'"[3] thus agreeing with the definition given in the *P.E.D.*, but not with the derivation.

The word is defined in the Mahāvagga of the Vinaya as the "face, head of all good states,"[4] but as Winternitz pointed out this derivation "is quite impossible."[5] Winternitz himself was inclined to explain *pātimokkha* as "that which is to be redeemed,"[6] but unfortunately he did not support this statement, except by saying he thought that the correct translation of *saṃgaraṃ pātimokkhaṃ* of *Jā.* v. 25 should be "a promise to be redeemed."

[1] *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p. 89 f.
[2] *Cf. Vin.* iii. 249, *paṭimuñcati*, to bind on or tie on a head-pad.
[3] *History of Buddhist Thought*, 15, n. 1.
[4] *Vin.* i. 103.
[5] *History of Indian Lit.*, ii. 22, n. 2.
[6] *Ibid.*

Nearly all these authorities agree that the term is borrowed from other sects, and dates from pre-Buddhist days.

The question of the composition of the Pātimokkha rules is one which, while being of the greatest interest, is not very likely to grow out of the speculative stage. This question has two sides to it: that of *when* and that of *how* the rules came to be formulated. I can only point out the existence of these problems, not attempting to solve them. The solution of the one would to a large extent elucidate the other.

The rules were either drawn up in their entirety in Gotama's lifetime; or they were drawn up in their entirety after his *parinibbāna* (utter waning); or some were drawn up during his lifetime and others afterwards. The last assumption is that most generally favoured by scholars, who adduce " additions and modifications," repetitions and inconsistencies, existing among the collection of rules.[1] Again, if it were held that the rules were codified into their present shape after Gotama's *parinibbāna*, this would not at all necessarily mean that they were not known and enforced during his ministry. The question of *how* they were composed likewise suggests three alternatives: either that some actual event led up to the framing of each rule; or that they were all formulated in readiness to meet events, but before these had occurred; or that some had an historical source, while others owe their existence to precautionary imagination.

It is conceivable that not one of the Pātimokkha rules was framed until someone, lay-followers or the more dependable monks and nuns, had seen, heard or suspected a mode of behaviour which seemed to them unfitting in a member of one of Gotama's Orders. Each rule is therefore very possibly the direct result of some actual event, and was not made with merely hypothetical cases of wrong-doing in mind. On detecting, even on suspecting that conduct unfitting in a recluse,

[1] *E.g.*, E. J. Thomas, *Hist. of Buddhist Thought*, p. 14.

unworthy of a monk had been perpetrated, the action was reported, as it is almost invariably stated, to Gotama, either by the errant monk himself or by those vigilant in the interests of the Order. The Suttavibhaṅga shows that if the action were found to be blameworthy, a course of training was set forth, a penalty was attached, and it henceforth became manifest that a breach of each rule of right conduct would incur a like penalty.

Prevention of unsuitable behaviour in monks and nuns seems to have rested on two bases. In the first place the presumption that a certain line of conduct had been forbidden by Gotama, apparently appealed to the purer-minded and more zealous monks. Secondly, the penalty, fixed commensurably with the breach of the rule, will doubtless have exercised a deterrent influence over the behaviour of some of those monks who were not susceptible to the dictates of loftier motives.

Although the framing of each major rule is without exception attributed to Gotama, it has never been suggested that at the inception of the Orders he thought over all the possible cases of wrong-doing and depravity of which the monks might be capable, and propounded a ready-made body of rules to meet every conceivable contingency. It is, however, more likely that the majority of the rules grew up gradually, as need arose, and are the outcome of historical developments that went on within the Order. At the same time it would not have been impossible for the Sakyans to have borrowed at all events the outline of a compendium of rules from other sects. We cannot tell with any degree of accuracy the historical Order in which the rules were formulated. All that can be said is, that there is no need to imagine that offences were perpetrated and rules promulgated in the order in which they now appear in the Suttavibhaṅga.

Again, it is to my mind questionable whether all the offences, grave and petty, all the adroit evasions and twistings, all the cases of illness which prevented a

rule from being carried out to the letter, all the multifarious detail of communal life, were reported to Gotama, who then pronounced his verdict, and either framed a new rule or altered an existing one.

The rules are doubtless ascribed to him so as to give them weight, but of what proportion he was in fact the author we can never know. We can merely judge that, as some of his disciples were competent to preach *dhamma*, so some would also have been competent to meet a case of wrong-doing by admonishment and rebuke, and by decreeing an appropriate penalty as a safeguard for the future. Indeed, in the Suttavibhaṅga, although by far the greater number of rules is said to have been enunciated by Gotama, many a sub-rule at least (as in Saṅgh. ix., x., xi.) is laid down without reference to the Founder. Although he remains the central figure in the Vinaya, any absence of reference to him is an indication either that some transgressions occurred and were legislated for after his *parinibbāna* (utter waning), or that, even while he was still alive, it was not thought necessary to trouble him with the entire mass of items, some of them very trivial, that was bound to arise in the organisation of "unenclosed" Orders of monks and nuns. This was the more complicated both because the members of the Orders were, and were recognised to be, at varying stages of spiritual development, and because their behaviour was not viewed solely as it affected internal policy, but also as it affected the laity.

For the believing laity, though naturally not to the forefront in the Vinaya, are in a remarkable way never absent, never far distant. They perpetually enter into the life of the Order as supporters, critics, donors, intensely interested; and themselves affected by Sakya, it seems that they were deeply anxious for its success. Thus the Vinaya does not merely lay down sets of rules whose province was confined to an internal conventual life. For this was led in such a way as to allow and even to encourage a certain degree of intercommunication with the lay supporters and followers,

no less than with those lay-people who were not adherents of the faith. What was important, was that the monks should neither abuse their dependence on the former, nor alienate the latter, but should so regulate their lives as to give no cause for complaint. With these aims in view, conduct that was not thought seemly for them to indulge in had to be carefully defined; and it became drafted in rule and precept.

Indian monasticism differs from Western in the important respect that the former stood in no need of fighting battles against temporal powers. The world in which Gotama's Orders grew up was fully in favour of experiments in religious devotion. Such struggles as there were, were not between monks and the armies of hostile kings, not between monks and the active scorn of the world, but struggles, no less heroic in intention perhaps, to strengthen the monks against themselves and their human weaknesses, to endow them with goodness and virtue as the living witnesses to man's desire for perfection, to fortify them for victory in the contest between the spirit and the flesh, between right and wrong—undying ideals to which many an ordinary layman ardently clung, but to which he could not himself aspire.

In the Vinaya literature that has come down to us, Gotama is nowhere shown as legislating for his lay-followers, as Mahāvīra did for his. Yet, even in the absence of a Vinaya for laymen, it is apparent that an attitude of toleration and common-sense admitted much that was permissible to the worldly section of the community that was not considered to be fitting in monks. Had no difference been insisted upon, one of the most potent reasons for the existence and for the popularity of monks would have been rendered invalid. For one of the points of entering Gotama's Order was to learn control of body, mind and speech. This, it was thought, was essential to spiritual progress, and was extremely hard to attain, unless the shackles of the household life had been laid aside. Then man, as monk, could more readily attain perfection and its fruit (*arahattaphala*),

the goal of *brahmacariya*, the good, divine, holy or Brahma-life. *Arahatta*, as the goal, was at some time in the early history of the Order substituted for that other goal: an approach to Brahma, that Highest, an approach which India, in the sixth century B.C., held that each and every man was potentially capable of making. Because religion was understood in those days, men who, according to popular estimate, showed that they were on the Way to the Highest, were this regarded as Brahma or *arahatta*, were revered and not despised.

Yet, as in any others, the Vinaya shows that there were in Gotama's Orders indolent, lax, greedy monks and nuns, those who were lovers of luxury, seekers after pleasure, makers of discord. We should, however, be greatly mistaken if we insisted upon regarding the Order as riddled by scandal, by abuses and by minor forms of wrong-doing. There is no doubt that these existed; but there is no justification, simply because they happen to be recorded, for exaggerating their frequency, or for minimising the probity and spiritual devotion of many men who, in Gotama's days, were monks. Records of these are to be found in the Nikāyas, in the Thera-therī-gāthā; and, too much overlooked, there are in the Vinaya, the virtuous, moderate monks who, vexed and ashamed, complain of the misdemeanours of their fellows.

As historians, we must be grateful to these inevitable backsliders, for theirs is this legacy of the Pātimokkha rules. Had the Order contained merely upright, scrupulous monks and nuns—those who were steadfastly set on the goal of the Brahma-life, and those who had, in the circumstances, to voice their annoyance with the wrong-doers—in all likelihood the Vinaya, the Discipline, the Pātimokkha rules would not have come into being, and much of the early history of the Order would now be known to us solely through the indirect and fragmentary way of the Sutta-Piṭaka.

If monks behaved in a way that was censurable in monks, this does not necessarily mean that their con-

duct was wrong in itself. Various activities were not only permissible for lay-people, but were fully accepted to be such as could be unquestionably pursued by them. Marriage, negotiating for parties to a marriage, trading, the owning of possessions, are cases in point. Nor could we maintain that, before a particular course of training had been made known, the conduct of a monk was necessarily reprehensible if it resembled that which was legitimate for the laity. For all monks came into the Order from the laity. Therefore if it did not at once strike them that in certain respects their behaviour should change when their vocation changed, it is only natural that in the meantime they should have indulged in pursuits for which, as laity, they had attracted no adverse criticism.

I think it very likely that some of the courses of training for monks that are included in this volume were formulated as a result of this bringing over of lay-life into the religious life; for a difference between the two had to be made, and then maintained. Others most certainly were formulated as the result of behaviour which, whether evinced by a layman or a monk, would have been regarded as equally blameworthy; others, again, to prevent the monks from being an intolerable burden on the laity; while still others were formulated so as to preserve the harmony and well-being of the Order.

Now and again, monks, contemplating a certain action which they knew to be forbidden or which they knew to be wrong, are recorded to think: "There will be no blame for me." Was this because they had done similar things while still "in the world" without incurring censure, and so thought that they would be immune from blame after they had gone forth? Or did they think that there was some reason why they personally would incur no offence for their deed? If so, spiritual pride had still to be humbled in them.

The Pātimokkha rules of the Pali Vinaya fall into eight sections, classified according to the gravity of

the offence committed. Of these eight sections, only three are covered by the present volume. These are, first, the four Pārājika rules, framed to govern those offences, the most serious of all, which involve "defeat," and whose penalty is expulsion from the Order; and secondly, the thirteen Saṅghâdisesa rules, framed for the type of offence which is so grave as to necessitate a formal meeting of the Saṅgha, or whole community of monks present in the district or in the vihāra where the offence was committed. The penalties incurred for a Saṅghâdisesa offence are chiefly that of being sent back by the monks to the beginning of the probationary period, together with that of undergoing the mānatta discipline. The terms *pārājika*, *saṅghâdisesa* and *mānatta* are shortly discussed on pp. xxvi f., xxix ff., 38, 195 f. below.

Thirdly, included in this volume, are the two Aniyata rules, designed to meet offences whose nature is so "undetermined" that only individual circumstances can decide whether it is such as to involve defeat, or a formal meeting of the Order, thereby being linked with the two preceding sections of rules; or whether it is such as to require expiation (*pācittiya*). Because of this further possibility, the Aniyata rules are linked with the next group but one, the Pācittiya rules.

The first three Pārājika rules are levelled against the breach of a code of morality generally recognised and active among all civilised communities: against unchastity, against the taking of what was not given, and against the depriving of life.

Evidently the aim of the strictures on unchastity, with which Pārājika I. is concerned, was partly to bring the monks into line with members of other preceding and contemporary sects whose members, having renounced the household state, had to be celibate. This notion already had history behind it by the time the Sakyan Order of monks came into being. It was a notion based as much on common-sense, as on the conviction that restraint and self-taming were indis-

pensable factors in the winning of the fruit of a monk's life.

It is perhaps not necessary to believe that each or any of the many and curious forms of unchastity, mentioned in Pārājika I., ever was actually perpetrated by a monk. Such comprehensive treatment as is found is not needed either to support or to elucidate the meaning of the general rule. This was clear enough. It is possible, of course, that some of the delinquencies did occur, while others did not, but we do not know. In any case, it is also possible that at the time of the final recension, each rule was minutely scrutinised and analysed, and all the deviations from it, of which the recensionists had heard or which they could imagine, were formulated and added in some kind of order. For then there would be in the future no doubt of the class of offence (*e.g.*, Pārājika, thullaccaya or dukkaṭa) to which any wrong behaviour that had been or should be committed, belonged, or of what was the statutory penalty for that offence. The smooth and detailed handling of some parts of the other Pārājika rules and of some of the Saṅghâdisesa rules, likewise suggests that these are the outcome, not of events, so much as of lengthy and anxious deliberations. The recensionists had a responsible task. They were legislating for the future, and they would, I think, have been determined to define in as minute a way as possible the offence already stated in a general way in each major rule.

Stealing is ranked as a Pārājika (Pār. II.), or the gravest kind of offence, not merely because civilisation agrees that, for various reasons, it is wrong to take something not given. It was particularly reprehensible for a Sakyan monk to steal, since at the time of his entry into the Order he morally renounced his claim to all personal and private possessions, and should henceforth have regarded anything he used as communal property, lent to him for his needs. In addition, it may be urged that if monks were restrained from stealing, any tendencies they may have had towards

greed and gluttony, towards finery and luxury, towards carelessness in the use of their requisites, would have been reduced and perhaps eradicated, thus allowing a greater margin for the exercise of unfettered spiritual endeavour.

There is a point in Pārājika II. to which I should like to draw attention. The rules concerned with taking what was not given show that stealing something of or above a definite, though small, value, namely, five *māsakas*,[1] is a more blameworthy offence than stealing something worth less than five *māsakas*. Five *māsakas* apparently constitute the lowest commercial value that an object can have, and anything less is presumably commercially valueless and therefore negligible. But all tendency towards acquisition had to be suppressed in the monks, all inclination to regard objects in the light of possible possessions to be checked. And further, it had to be remembered that monks might not know the exact value of some particular object.[2]

In Pārājika II., the value in *māsakas* of the object stolen becomes the standard of moral transgression, and hence the criterion of the gravity of the offence committed: to steal something of more than five *māsakas* entails defeat; to steal something of the value of from one to four *māsakas* is said to be a grave offence;[3] while to steal something worth less than one *māsaka* is called an offence of wrong-doing.[4] Thus the gravity of the offence of stealing is shown to be to some extent dependent upon the value of the object stolen. At *Vin.* i. 96, on the other hand, it is said to be an offence entailing defeat to steal even a blade of grass. These inconsistencies doubtless suggest that these rules were drawn up at different times.[5]

No doubt the depriving of life ranked as a Pārājika

---

[1] Below, p. 85. [2] Below, p. 114.

[3] *Thullaccayá*, a technical term.

[4] *Dukkaṭa*, another technical term.

[5] See *Vin. Texts*, i. xxv, for plausible argument for the introduction of the new terms *thullaccaya* and *dukkaṭa* into the final recension of the Vinaya.

offence (Pār. III.) partly because it is the very opposite of *ahiŋsā*, non-violence, non-injury, which was an idea prevalent in India before the advent of Sakya. Again, the teaching on rebirth and the allied teaching on *karma*, both pre-Sakyan notions, would hold that the murderer, in consequence of his deed, obstructs his progress through the worlds, until he has worked off the fruit of his action. The problems of Freewill and Predetermination find no place in Indian philosophy. Man's will is *assumed* to be free. Hence the murderer might have chosen otherwise: the deed of murdering was not pre-ordained. To incite a person to death was considered as bad as murdering him. For if praise of "the beauty of death" inspired him to die at will, if he cut himself off before he had done his time here, the fruits of past deeds, both good and ill, would still remain to be worked off by him.

It may seem strange to a European living in the twentieth century that the offences of unchastity, stealing and murder receive the same legal punishment. But different ages have different values. In England, hanging was the penalty for sheep-stealing up to modern times. And the Pātimokkha rules relate to more than two thousand years ago, some of them being rooted in an even more remote antiquity. Besides, we must remember that they were for monks, and not only for Sakyan monks. The Jains had precepts corresponding to these first three Pārājika rules, as did the common precursors of Jain and Sakyan, the *sañyāsins* or brahmin ascetics and recluses.[1]

Those who had gone forth into homelessness were to withstand all temptation and ambition offered by life "in the world," they were to be beyond the reach of its quarrels, loves and hatreds. For, if they continued to behave as those who had not gone forth, their supporters would fall away, the non-believers would think but little of them, and the believers would not increase in number.

[1] See Jacobi, *Jaina Sūtras*, i. xxiii (*S.B.E.* xxii.).

The injunctions against unchastity, the taking of what was not given, and against the depriving of life, besides corresponding to the brahmin and Jain precepts, also correspond to the first three Buddhist *sīlas*, moral "habits," or precepts of ethical behaviour. These, however, run in reverse order from the Pārājikas, and begin with the precept of refraining from onslaught on creatures. Next comes refraining from taking what was not given, and thirdly the precept of refraining from unchastity (here called *abrahmacariya*, as it is in the Jain *sūtras*). The fourth Pārājika, alone of the Pārājikas, does not find any corresponding matter among the *sīlas*. If the relation of the Pārājikas to the *sīlas* were worked out, some cogent reason for these discrepancies might emerge.

At present I can only suggest that the fourth Pārājika, of which I have shortly spoken elsewhere,[1] is concerned more with a monk's spiritual state than with his outward behaviour.[2] In this it differs from the *sīlas*, and more interesting still, from the other Pātimokkha rules. These are, with the striking exception of the fourth Pārājika, concerned with the here and now, with the regulation of certain aspects of community life, with matters affecting the Order, with the arrangement of various mundane affairs, with questions of conduct concerning the opposite sex and the lay followers, with questions of property.

The curious fourth Pārājika, concerned with the offence of "claiming a state or quality of further-men" (*uttarimanussadhamma*), seems to have been fashioned in some different mould, and to belong to some contrasting realm of values. It is by no means a mere condemnation of boasting or lying in general, for it is the particular nature of the boast or the lie which makes the offence one of the gravest that a monk can commit: the boast of having reached some stage in

[1] *Early Buddhist Theory of Man Perfected*, p. 111 ff.

[2] The fifth Jain precept, to renounce all interest in worldly things, calling nothing one's own (*aparigraha*), seems to be on a rather different basis from the other Jain precepts.

spiritual development, only attainable after a long training in the fixed and stable resolve to become more perfect, and to make the potential in him assume actuality. The seriousness of the offence of unfoundedly claiming a state of further-men is further emphasised by the statement at Pārājika iv. 4 that, if a deliberate lie is uttered in connection with such a claim, then that lie constitutes an offence entailing defeat. Yet, in the Suttavibhaṅga, it is far more common to find that deliberate lying ranks as an offence requiring expiation (*pācittiya*), which is not nearly so grave as one "involving defeat."

I have suggested elsewhere that the claiming of a state, or states, of further-men, to which the claimant was not entitled, could have only appeared as a most heinous offence to people by whom a teaching on becoming, on becoming more perfect, of going further, was held in much esteem. Perhaps the greatest of Mrs. Rhys Davids' many contributions to the interpretation of Early Buddhism, is that this idea of becoming was of living power and force to Gotama's early followers. If so, one may conclude, tentatively, that the fourth Pārājika belongs to an ancient Sakyan stratum, and that in this, other-worldly (*lokuttara*) matters were held to be as important as, if not more so than, worldly (*loka*) matters. For I think it possible that the Pārājikas are arranged in an ascending scale of gravity, in which the offence held to be the worst morally, though not legally, is placed last. Be this as it may, if spiritual progress and development had not been valued by the Sakyans, to whom this precept appears to be peculiar, the offence of untruly claiming the attainment of this or that advanced spiritual state could not have ranked as a Pārājika offence.

It should be remarked that talk on conditions of further-men, though not absent from the Sutta-Piṭaka, is at no place accentuated in it. There is, for example, a Saṃyutta passage, which is the exact parallel of a long Vinaya passage, with the noteworthy exception that in the former there is no reference to Moggallāna

as one held by other monks to be claiming a state of further-men, an imputed claim which seems to be the pivot of the Vinaya passage.[1]

I have chosen to translate *pārājika* by "defeat" chiefly, I admit, because Rhys Davids and Oldenberg rendered it in this way. They follow Buddhaghosa, who, to quote E. J. Thomas,[2] "interprets *pārājika* as 'suffering defeat,' and the Mūlasarvāstivādins appear to do the same (Mvyut. 278, 9)." The editors of *Vinaya Texts* refer "the word to the passive of *ji* (to defeat) with *parā* prefixed."[3] B. C. Law also considers these four rules are concerned with "acts which bring about defeat."[4] Although it may be grammatically incorrect to refer *pārājika* to *parā-ji*,[5] to my mind no more convincing derivation has so far been put forward. Burnouf's idea[6] (adopted by Childers[7] and others) is that *pārājika* is derived from *parā+aj*, meaning a crime which involves the expulsion or exclusion of the guilty party. *Parā+aj* may be a better source, grammatically speaking, for *pārājika* than is *parā+ji*. Yet, that the sense intended is "defeat," seems to me rather less doubtful than that it is expulsion, and *aj*, though a Vedic root, meaning "to drive away," is unknown as a root in Pali.

It might be argued that because in each promulgation of the Pārājika rules the words *pārājiko hoti* is followed by the word *asaṃvāso*, "not in communion," this is because the two are complementary, *asaṃvāsa* filling out the sense intended by *pārājika*. Such an argument would naturally increase the tendency to regard *pārājika* as a word standing for expulsion or exclusion, probably of a permanent nature.[8] But may it not be that *pārājika* and *asaṃvāsa* represent not

---

[1] *S*. ii. 254-262=*Vin*. iii. 104 ff. See below, p. 180 ff.
[2] *Hist. of Bud. Thought*, 16, n. 2.
[3] *Vin. Texts*, i. 3 n.
[4] *Hist. of Pali Lit.*, i. 47, 50.
[5] *E.g.*, Kern, *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, 85.
[6] *Intr. à l'Hist. du Buddhisme indien*, 2nd edn., 268.
[7] *Dict.*
[8] E. J. Thomas, *Hist. of Buddhist Thought*, 16; Kern, *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, 85.

complementary, but disparate ideas, the not being in communion introducing a new notion, and one connected with and dependent upon not expulsion, but defeat?

If a monk were found to be unworthy to be in communion, unfitted to take his part in the communal acts and jurisdiction, then he would have to be expelled. But equally, he would have to cease to be in communion (which would entail expulsion, either temporary or permanent), if he found that he was defeated in his endeavour "to achieve the end for which he entered the Order."[1]

It is beyond all doubt that the punishment for breach of the Pārājika rules indeed involves expulsion. But it seems unnecessary to take the etymologically obscure *pārājika* itself to mean expulsion, when this notion is covered by the word *asaṃvāsa*, with which, as I have said, *pārājika* is always coupled in the formulation of the Pārājika rules. In addition, it may be remarked that the Suttavibhaṅga has the verb *nāseti* (causative of *nassati*), meaning "to be expelled."[2]

In such a very controversial case, I have preferred to follow the commentator. It appears very probable that many of these words: Pātimokkha, Pārājika itself, Saṅghâdisesa, were adopted from pre-Buddhist sects, and thus had some tradition behind them. Now, it may well be that the commentator explained the word *pārājika* according to a meaning that for it and for him had become traditional. In which case, such an explanation will as truly enshrine something of the history of that word as later and inconclusive attempts at grammatical analysis. Moreover, the reference, in the third formulation of Pārājika I., to not disavowing the training and not declaring weakness, together with the subsequent detailed analysis of these phrases (below, p. 42 ff.), to my mind lends weight to the suggestion that a monk becomes one who is defeated

[1] B. C. Law, *Hist. of Pali Lit.*, i. 47, n. 1; also *cf.* p. 50.
[2] *E.g.*, *Vin.* iii. 33, 40=pp. 50, 62 below.

(*pārājiko hoti*)[1] through his own inability or "weakness" to lead the Brahma-life.

Like the Pārājika rules, the Saṅghâdisesas begin (in Saṅghâdisesa II.—Saṅghâdisesa I. is in a category apart) with four rules connected with a monk's conduct towards women. Then come two rules (Saṅghâdisesa VI., VII.) in which injunctions for building a hut and a vihāra on sites approved by other monks, are set forth. The point of these rules appears to be to prevent monks from begging building materials too greedily from the laity, and to prevent them from building anywhere where animal life would be endangered or destroyed. The force of the injunction that the hut or the vihāra must have an open space round it, is difficult to interpret, and the Old Commentary gives no practical help. It probably means that no monk should live in a secret place. The laity, who had contributed to the building of the hut or vihāra, would very likely wish to have seen that the monk was behaving in a way worthy of their gift, and hence his conduct and habits must be open to unhindered inspection.

Saṅghâdisesa VIII. and IX. comprise rules against the defamation of one monk by another. Then come two against the making of a schism in the Order, while Saṅghâdisesa XII. is concerned with the offence that a monk incurs if he is difficult to speak to. All such transgressions, leading to disharmony in the Order, would have made it hard for the Order to maintain itself and to progress. And if there had been repeated quarrels, discord and stubbornness, the Order would have become discredited among its lay supporters.

The twelfth Saṅghâdisesa should be compared with the Anumāna Sutta.[2] The Old Commentary's definition of *dubbacajātika*, "difficult to speak to" (*Vin.*

---

[1] On *hoti*=*bhavati*, to become, see Mrs. Rhys Davids, *To Become or Not to Become*, p. 18 ff.

[2] *M*. Sta. 15. Bu. at *VA*. 742, says that this Sutta is one of the five spoken for the disciples of the four groups (*i.e.*, monks and nuns, male and female lay-followers).

iii. 178=p. 311 below), is word for word the same as the Anumāna's description of the monk whom his fellows consider unfit to be taught or instructed.[1] Buddhaghosa states[2] that the Ancients (*porāṇā*) called this Sutta the Bhikkhu-pātimokkha. This leads us to wonder if the twelfth Saṅghâdisesa indeed represents some specially ancient fragment of the Pātimokkha, and whether, while the rules were being shaped, refusal to take the training with deference and respect appeared amongst the earliest offences that a monk could commit.

The last and thirteenth Saṅghâdisesa rule is against bringing families into disrepute. This, again, would make the Order unpopular among the lay followers. It must be remembered that it was considered highly important to propitiate these, to court their admiration, to keep their allegiance, to do nothing to annoy them. For without their active interest and support the Order could not have endured. It is true that, had it been disbanded, the Sakyaputtiyas, as individuals, would not have come to starvation. For the "holy man," be he *samaṇa*, *sādhu*, *sañyāsin* or *fakir*, in India always has had his physical needs fulfilled. And some Sakyaputtiyas doubtless could have reverted to a household life; while others might have gone to dwell in the forests, there to subsist on fruits and roots (*phalamūla*), and to dress in bark and antelopes' hides, as did some of their brahmin precursors and contemporaries. But, in fact, the Order became a powerful magnet, attracting men and women from many and various families, classes, trades and occupations, from the ranks of the Jains and Wanderers (*paribbājaka*). Historically, the success of the Early Buddhist experiment in monasticism must be in great part attributed to the wisdom of constantly considering the susceptibilities and criticisms of the laity.

Like the meaning of *pārājika*, the meaning of *saṅghâdisesa* is controversial. Again B. C. Law[3] and I follow

[1] *M.* i. 95, *l.* 12 ff. [2] *MA.* ii. 67.
[3] *Hist. of Pali Lit.*, i. 47, 50.

Vinaya Texts in rendering *saṅghâdisesa* as offences (or rules or matters) which require a formal meeting of the Order.

Now, one part of the penalty imposed for a breach of any one of the thirteen Saṅghâdisesa rules, namely, a return to the beginning of the probationary period, has apparently led Kern, for example, to describe the Saṅghâdisesas as offences "involving suspension and a temporary exclusion"[1]—from the Order or from taking part in its legal procedure is not made clear, though the latter must be meant. The other part of the penalty, namely, the necessity of undergoing the mānatta discipline, has apparently led E. J. Thomas,[2] for example, to describe these offences as those which involve "a period of penance and reinstatement by the Assembly." Burnouf suggests[3] that *saṅghâdisesa* means "that which should be declared to the Saṅgha from the beginning to the end." He further states that the Chinese syllables, *pho chi cha*, the equivalents of *âdisesa*, are "probably altered." This may be because the Pali had already been altered from some more definite phrase containing less ambiguity and obscurity. Childers suggests[4] that this class of offence is so called because as much in the beginning (*âdi*) as in the end (*sesa*) a Saṅgha is required to administer the stages of penalty and ultimately rehabilitation.

Neither of the descriptions—suspension or penance—is contained etymologically in the word *saṅghâdisesa*. That both were penalties incurred by this type of offence is indubitable. But by derivation, the compound *saṅghâdisesa* could not possibly mean either suspension, mānatta discipline or reinstatement. Comparison with the Sanskrit brings us no nearer to an elucidation. For as Kern remarks,[5] "Neither a Sanskrit Saṅghâvaśesa nor Saṅghâtiśesa, *i.e.* remnant of the Saṅgha, renders a satisfactory meaning."

---

[1] *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, p. 85.
[2] *History of Buddhist Thought*, p. 17.
[3] *Intr. à l'Hist. du Buddhisme indien*, 2nd edn., p. 269.
[4] *Dict.*
[5] *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, p. 85, n. 9.

In the circumstances it is best to allow that we are in the realm of ancient technicalities, whose exact significance the passage of time has dimmed. In a translation, we can, however, pay due regard to the only member of the compound *saṅghâdisesa* which is neither grammatically obscure nor controversial. This is *saṅgha*, meaning for Sakya the Order, or any part of the whole Order resident within a certain boundary, district or vihāra. That the offence could not be settled without the intervention of the Order is a point for which there is the support of the Old Commentary. This states clearly that "it is the Order which places (the wrong-doer) on probation, it sends (him) back to the beginning, it inflicts the mānatta, it rehabilitates."[1] Moreover, as noted by Childers, Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, this type of punishment had to be enforced, could only be enforced, by formal resolutions (*saṅgha-kamma*) carried at meetings of the Order.

It is just possible that *kamma*, most usually work, which the Old Commentary states is a synonym for this class of offence, has also a specialised sense of "proceedings, ceremony performed by a lawfully constituted Saṅgha of monks." Such proceedings were formal in character, with motions and resolutions, and rules for their validity. Thus, if *kamma* were indeed a synonym for this class of offence, and if it means acts of a formal nature, then what *saṅghâdisesa* means is a type of offence whose punishment must be meted out by some formal administration on the part of the Order.

It may well be that the penalty for every class of offence could be imposed, or came at some time to be regarded as effective, only as the result of the jurisdiction of the Order met together in solemn conclave. This, however, would not prove that the word *saṅghâdisesa* does not contain some special reference to the Order as that instrument which, in this type of offence, administers the penalty. It is more than possible that

[1] See below, p. 196.

some of the other rules were known and named before the codification of the Pātimokkha, but that the penalty for breaking them could be imposed by one or more individuals. Otherwise it could hardly have been necessary for the Old Commentary expressly to state that it is the Order, and not one man or many persons, which imposes the Saṅghâdisesa penalties.[1]

As S. Dutt shrewdly observes,[2] "It is significant that only one of the group of offences (*Saṅghâdisesa*) is mentioned as coming within the disciplinary jurisdiction of the Saṅgha, and it is in the case of this group only that certain penalties to be imposed upon the Bhikkhu, even against his will . . . viz. *Parivāsa* and *Mānatta*, are laid down. In the case of the other offences it is nowhere stated or suggested in the Pātimokkha itself that the Saṅgha should have jurisdiction over them, and no mode of exercising such jurisdiction is defined, as in the case of the *Saṅghâdisesas*."

It is not impossible that originally the various Saṅghas, which were really sub-divisions of the whole Saṅgha, exercised their jurisdiction over each individual member only in the case of the Saṅghâdisesa offences, only coming later to exercise such jurisdiction in the case of all classes of offence. If this is so, we do well, I think, to underline the formalities which the Saṅghâdisesa offences entailed, and were very likely alone in so doing at first. For by this means some early feature of the Order's history may be kept in mind.

The two Aniyatas, or undetermined matters, evince a remarkable amount of trust put in a woman lay-follower. Doubtless Visākhā was one of the most generous patrons of the Order, a great supporter of the faith, to whom the Order had full reason to be grateful. Here she is shown expostulating with Udāyin for what seemed to her unsuitable behaviour in a monk. The interesting thing is that both the Aniyata rules, generalised as are all the Pātimokkha courses of training from

---

[1] See below, p. 196. [2] *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p. 105.

a particular case, allow a monk "to be dealt with" according to what a trustworthy woman lay-follower should say. Thus Visākhā, herself eminently trustworthy and single-minded in her efforts to improve conditions in the Order, is instrumental in bringing to all reliable women lay-followers the responsibility of procuring investigation into a monk's conduct, if she has seen him sitting secluded with a woman. These two Aniyata rules indicate the respect and deference that was, at that time, paid to women. They were not scornfully brushed aside as idle gossips and frivolous chatter-boxes, but their words were taken seriously.

It may be pointed out here that the Vinaya shows that if monks went astray, this was not always due to the baneful influence of women. For now and again monks took the initiative, and begged and cajoled lay-women and even nuns. Sometimes they got what they wanted, at others the women stood firm. When they asked lewd questions, women are shown as being innocent of their meaning.[1] It is also apparent from the two Aniyatas that women of the world might do certain things with impunity, but that those same things, if done by Sakyan recluses, were blameworthy. Their life was to be organised on a different basis, as Pārājika I. shows, from that of the laity, and a recognition of this, and attempts to preserve the difference, are visible in many parts of *Vinaya* III.

The Old Commentary, or Padabhājanīya, is now incorporated in the Suttavibhaṅga, and forms an integral part of it. Since it explains each Pātimokkha rule word by word, so that we get from it the meaning which the words possessed at all events at the time when the Old Commentary was compiled, this ancient exegesis, often of very great interest, is a most valuable critical apparatus. The purpose of the Old Commentary was evidently to make each rule absolutely clear, so that no misconception could arise through lack of lucid defini-

[1] P. 219 below.

tion. Words not contained in the rule, but appearing in the stories, are not commented upon.

Rhys Davids and Oldenberg think that when the rules had been formulated and each word interpreted, some explanation was wanted as to how the rules originated. Thus, they hold, stories were invented to introduce each rule. Personally I do not think it necessary to take quite such a hard-and-fast view. For it seems to me possible that in some cases the story may be true, or may have had some historical foundation, so that the rule came to be made on account of the self-same events which, later, were recorded. In other cases, the story may quite possibly be an invention, the original reason for framing the rule and the name of the first wrong-doer involved having long been forgotten. It would now be very difficult to judge which stories may be more or less true and which may be purely fictitious.

The point of the series of short stories or incidents, which usually follow the Old Commentary's exegesis, is to show what exceptions could be made to a rule, what exemptions were permissible, what lesser and sometimes what graver offences were incurred, and what was an offence from which there could be no exemption since it tallied in all its main respects with that which had led to the framing of the rule. These stories are not invariably ascribed to any particular person, as are those introducing the rule. They not seldom attach the behaviour which needs consideration to " a certain monk."

These stories reveal the existence of different grades of penalty for different types of offence against the main rules. Not merely are there five great classes of offences—Pārājika, Saṅghâdisesa, Nissaggiya Pācittiya, Pācittiya and Pāṭidesaniya—there are also *thullaccaya* (grave) offences, and *dukkaṭa* offences (those of wrong-doing). These are of constant recurrence in the stories, or "Notes giving the exceptions to, and extensions of, the Rule in the Pātimokkha."[1] Of rarer appearance

[1] *Vin. Texts*, i. xix.

are offences of wrong speech. One or other of these offences is said to be incurred if behaviour has approximated to that which a particular Pātimokkha rule has been designed to restrain, but which is, so far as can be judged, not so grave in nature as a breach of the rule itself, because of certain differences in its execution, or because of certain extenuating circumstances.

Sometimes the stories are grouped together to form a set. Although, where this occurs, each story may show no more than a minute variation from the others, they are all set out at length. Putting the gist of the stories into general terms, each one would then read something as follows: If this is done, but not that, though the other thing is done, such and such an offence is incurred. If this is done and that, but not the other thing, such and such an offence is incurred. If this is not done, but that is done, and the other thing is (is not) done, such and such an offence is incurred. And so on through permutation and combination of deeds done or not done, until the final case is achieved where no offence is incurred.

These groups of stories are apt to be tedious to Western readers. I have therefore put them, when they occur, into a smaller type, as also other passages concerned with small shades of differences. Doubtless such meticulous detail was useful in defining exactly what was lawful and what was not lawful for monks to do, and in preventing the evasions which from time to time they seemed ready to attempt. As history, these stories are as interesting in evincing an Oriental love and management of detail as in revealing items of topical value in regard to manners and customs. The manner and time of their formulation are as problematical as those of the major rules.

At the end of each Pārājika, Saṅghâdisesa and Aniyata Rule, general circumstances are stated where the breach of the rule is not to be counted as an offence. The most comprehensive of these is when a monk is mad, in pain or a beginner. Others have a more specialised import. Thus, for example, there is said to be no

offence if a monk had some course of behaviour forced upon him, but did not consent to it (as in Pārājika I.); if he did something accidentally, not intending to do it (as in Pārājika III.); if he did something unsuitable, being under a misapprehension (as in Pārājika II.).

The occasions when it is stated that no offence is incurred are all remarkable for their humane and lenient tone, for their reasonableness and common-sense. Thus there is no offence if something not given is taken for the sake of food (Pārājika II. 7. 38), or is only taken for the time being (Pārājika II. 7. 40), it being assumed, apparently, that there was the intention of returning it. Again, two occasions are recorded[1] where a monk died, in the one case through being tickled,[2] and in the other through being trod upon.[3] Yet no murderous act was done, or the verdict would have been different, and not that "there is no offence involving defeat." It seems probable that the monks who died were nervy, delicate or infirm, and received a shock or heart-attack resulting in their death, but had they been in normal health they would have come to no harm.

It must be admitted that several early literatures have a coarse side. That the translations of Pali canonical works have so far been not in the least offensive, is mainly, or it may be said *only*, because the Sutta-Piṭaka and the Abhidhamma-Piṭaka deal chiefly with spiritual matters. The Vinaya, on the other hand, being concerned with behaviour, is forced occasionally to go into some aspects of life irrelevant to the subject-matter of the other two Piṭakas. Such expositions are, however, almost entirely confined to Pārājika I. and Saṅghâdisesa I.

---

[1] *Vin.* iii. 84 (=pp. 145, 146 below).

[2] *aṅgulipatodaka.* *P.E.D.* has "nudging with the fingers," *C.P.D.* "tickling with the fingers." *Dial.* i. 113 has in the text "nudging one another with the fingers," but *loc. cit.*, n. 3, in referring to the above *Vin.* passage (=*Vin.* iv. 110) says: "It must there mean 'tickling.'" *G.S.* iv. 225 (*A.* iv. 343) has "poking one another with the fingers."

[3] Or *ottharati* may mean to spread out, to stretch out.

With regard to this preservation of crude passages in the Vinaya, three points must be insisted upon. In the first place they were neither spoken nor written down for a general public, but were intended only for the devotees of celibacy. Secondly, the motive which led to their being uttered or written down was not a desire to shock, but the need to prevent unchastity. Thirdly, the pattern on which the compilers of the Suttavibhaṅga worked was one of almost unbelievable detail, for in their efforts to be lucid, case after case of possible or actual deviation from the general rule was investigated, penalised and perpetuated. Hence it cannot justly be said that the tendency to be detailed is greater or more insistent in one Pārājika, or in one Saṅghâdisesa, than in others. Such lack of restraint as is found may be embarrassing to us, but it must be remembered that early peoples are not so much afraid of plain speech as we are. No stigma of indecency or obsçenity should therefore be attached to such Vinaya passages as seem unnecessarily outspoken to us. For they were neither deliberately indecent nor deliberately obscene. The matters to which they refer had to be legislated for as much as had matters of theft and murder, of choosing sites for huts and vihāras.

Nevertheless the differences in the outlook of an early society and a modern one may easily be forgotten or disregarded. I have therefore omitted some of the cruder Suttavibhaṅga passages, and have given abbreviated versions of others, while incorporating them in their unabridged state in Pali in an Appendix, and marking them by an asterisk in the text. Even in omitting or expurgating such passages, I yet think that they are interesting historically, scientifically and psychologically, even psycho-analytically, and that they might be of value to anyone making a detailed comparison of Eastern and Western Monachism.

Of the various forms of address recorded in *Vin.* iii., pp. 1-194 (to which this volume of translation corresponds), the most frequent are *bhagavā*, *bhante*,

bho, āyasmā, āvuso, ayya, bhagini. I will do no more now than briefly indicate them, leaving a fuller investigation to the Introduction to the final volume, when all the Vinaya data for modes of address will be before us.

Only Gotama is recorded to be addressed as *bhagavā.* This, therefore, is a very honourable term, which I have rendered by " lord."

Bhante, one of several vocative forms of *bhavant,* is of very frequent occurrence. When Gotama is addressed as *bhante,* I have used the rendering " lord." In order to preserve this appellation for him alone, when the named and unnamed monks who are his disciples are addressed as *bhante,* I have used the rendering " honoured sir."

Bho (plural *bhonto*), another vocative form of *bhavant,* appears to be a more familiar form of address than is *bhante,* and is used as between equals, or from a superior to an inferior. It is of fairly frequent occurrence, sometimes being followed by another vocative, such as a proper name. I have translated *bho* as " good sir."

Āyasmā is not a form of address. It is an honorific designation, and is the most usual way in which monks and *theras* are referred to in the narrative, followed by their proper name. I have translated it as " the venerable." Nuns are never designated by this term, nor are lay-people.

Āvuso may be said to be the habitual mode of address used between monks. The only other word that they appear to use in speaking to one another is *bhante.*[1] They are also recorded to address laymen as *āvuso,* and this practice is sometimes reversed, although the laity seem more usually to have said *bhante* in speaking

[1] Franke in *J.P.T.S.*, 1908, holds that the Cullavagga Council reports were invented exercises to show ways of address. His argument is based on the decree of *D.* ii. 154, ascribed to the dying Gotama, after which seniors were to address juniors as *āvuso,* while juniors were to address seniors as *bhante.*

The terms *āuso* and *bhamte* were also in use among the Jains, *cf.* Āyāramgasutta (*P.T.S.* edn.), *e.g.* p. 106.

to the monks, sometimes combined with *ayya*. I have translated *āvuso* as "your reverence" and "reverend sir." Since *āvuso* is masculine in form, it was never used in addressing nuns.

Ayya and *ayyo* (nom. plural used as a voc.) are frequently used in speaking of a person and in addressing him, both directly and obliquely. It appears to be more flexible than the other terms noted above, both with regard to those who use it and with regard to those to whom it is applied. I have translated it as "master" if followed by a proper name, and as "the master" if this is not the case. It is not infrequently combined with *bhante*. *Ayya* was an epithet in use among the laity, as well as between the laity and the monks. But in the part of the Vinaya translated in this volume it does not happen that a lay-person is addressed as *ayya* by a monk, or that any monk is so addressed by a fellow-monk.

Although monks did not address their fellows in the Brahma-life as *ayya*, nuns use *ayye* (fem., "lady, noble lady") in speaking to one another. Laywomen also use this form of address in speaking to nuns and to other laywomen. Monks, however, never appear to address either nuns or laywomen as *ayye*.

Bhagini, "sister," is the most usual way in which monks are recorded to address both laywomen and nuns. Yet nuns do not, as far as is recorded, address one another as *bhagini*. Unluckily, in this portion of the Vinaya there are no records of intercommunication between nuns and laywomen, so we get here no indication of how they addressed one another.

From these short notes it will have emerged that the words *bhikkhu* and *bhikkhuni* do not occur as forms of address used between the two sections of the religious community, any more than that lay-people address monks and nuns with these terms. On the other hand, Gotama is sometimes recorded to address a monk as *bhikkhu*, and also to refer to individual monks in this fashion. And there is a certain story (*Vin.* iii. 131 = p. 220 below) in which a female wanderer addresses a

monk as *bhikkhu*. In the narrative, monks are ordinarily spoken of as *bhikkhu*, unless the personal name of the monk concerned has been recorded. If it has, it is usually preceded by *āyasmā*, and never, I think, by *bhikkhu*. On the other hand, the narrative, if referring to a nun, consistently calls her *bhikkhunī*, and this description precedes her proper name, if this has been recorded. In this part of the Suttavibhaṅga there are no records showing Gotama speaking with nuns, so we have no means of knowing how he usually addressed them. When speaking of them, he is, however, recorded to have used the word *bhikkhunī*.

The translation of the term *bhikkhu* presents many difficulties. I have selected the term "monk," and have rejected "mendicant, almsman, brother, friar," not necessarily because "monk" is the most literal, but, for reasons which I will state shortly, it appears to me the best and most suitable rendering.

Although neither "monk," nor the terms rejected, are precise equivalents for *bhikkhu*, I could not find sufficient grounds for leaving *bhikkhu* untranslated, as though it were untranslatable. Further, I became more and more convinced that where an English word is possible, where it coincides to some extent with the significance of the Pali, although the known facts of history preclude full identity of meaning, it is more desirable to use it than to leave the word untranslated. Untranslated words are balking to the English reader, and it is for the English reader that this series is primarily designed. But before giving the reasons which determined my choice of "monk" as the nearest equivalent for *bhikkhu*, a few words must be said about each of the terms that has not been selected.

"Mendicant," literally "a beggar for alms," from *mendicare*, to beg, *mendicus*, "a beggar," is also doubtless etymologically correct[1] as a translation of *bhikkhu*.

[1] *Cf.* Burnouf, *Intr. à l'Hist. du Buddhisme indien*, 2nd edn., p. 245, where he says that the sense of the word *bhikkhu* means exactly "one who lives by alms."

Yet, I think, it lays too much emphasis on one aspect only of the *bhikkhu's* life, and ignores the other connotations of *bhikkhu* adduced by the Old Commentary,[1] as well as his functions of meditation and preaching. Moreover, in English it has no feminine, unless one falls back on the cumbersome "woman (or female) mendicant," as one is forced to say "woman (or female) slave" (*dāsī*) and "woman (or female) recluse" (*samaṇī*), a practice to be avoided as far as possible.

Professor B. M. Barua speaks of the *bhikṣus* as "Buddhist mendicants, monks or recluses,"[2] a sentence which well shows the hesitation which all translators must feel in trying to translate the term *bhikkhu*. An objection here would be, though it is a fault into which we all fall, that "Buddhist" is an anachronism, since "Buddhist" and "Buddhism" are terms of a much later invention. "Sakyan mendicant" would be possible; and it is true that here, as in all the other translations for *bhikkhu* that are being considered, the word "Sakyan" is wanted in all cases where it is necessary to distinguish the monastic followers of Gotama from those adherents of other sects who were also known as *bhikṣu*. But I doubt if the Pali Canon demands the drawing of such a distinction, for in it, I believe, the term *bhikkhu* denotes exclusively the Sakyan *bhikkhu*. Moreover, if it came to the feminine, the phrase "Sakyan female mendicant" would be unwieldy, and it seems a pity to use three words where two should suffice.

"Almsman" has "almswoman" for its feminine, and is further doubtless etymologically correct. For *bhikṣa* and *bhikṣuh* (Skrt.) are the noun and participle derived from the desiderative base of *bhaj*, to beg, to beg for alms. But again, like "mendicant," it lays too strong a stress on one aspect only of what the words *bhikkhu* and *bhikkhunī* came to stand for. For the Sakyan *bhikkhu* came to be much more than one dependent on others for the necessities of life. This is

[1] *Vin.* iii. 24.

[2] *Maskarī as an Epithet of Gośāla, Ind. Hist. Quart.*, iii. 2, p. 253.

one of the reasons why I have not adopted Lord Chalmers' rendering of "almsman"[1] here, as I have elsewhere.[2] Again, "almsman" may not inevitably mean one who asks for or who lives on alms, for it may also be used to mean a giver of alms. In addition, "almsman" would have a cumbrous translation in German and some other European languages. Hence I think that, as a possible rendering, it should be rejected.

"Brother" is, as a translation of *bhikkhu*, historically incorrect. It is the term by which *bhikkhu* is rendered in the Cambridge translation of the Jātakas, and the English title of the *P.T.S.*'s translation of the Theragāthā reads "Psalms of the Brethren." *Thera* is merely a *bhikkhu* of long standing. In spite of the recommendation for "brother" derived from its use in these works, the advance in Pali studies since the date of their publication shows that *bhikkhu* does not mean what "brother" means. It might be argued that the term "brother" draws attention to the *bhikkhu's* relation to his fellow-members of the religious community, and that such a relation was explicitly recognised, in so far as *bhikkhus* addressed the *bhikkhunīs* not as *bhikkhuni* but as *bhagini*, "sister."

Yet against this argument we must set the fact that neither Order looked to anyone or to any kind of being as their "father" or their "mother." Nor were the vihāras ruled over by anyone corresponding to an abbot, father or bishop. Power of authority was not vested in an individual, but in the Pātimokkha courses of training and the Order (*Saṅgha*) of monks. All that can be said is, that the *bhikkhus* were "brethren" to the extent that, apart from the three grades of *theras* (Elders), those of middle standing, and novices, no hierarchy existed among them, but terms of more or less equality.

There is, besides, another argument, to my mind so insuperable as to extinguish the claims of "brother" as in any way a suitable term by which to render *bhikkhu*.

[1] *Fur. Dial.*

[2] *Women under Primitive Buddhism.*

For *bhātar*, the accepted word for "brother," and one in current terminology, was never apparently regarded as synonymous with *bhikkhu*, and indeed never seems to have been connected with members of the Order. These are never recorded to address one another or laymen as *bhāta*. Nor do the lay-people so address them. Had "brother" been wanted, had it been able to fulfil some purpose in the monastic life, surely *bhātar* would have been used, for it was to hand. As it is, the word seems to have been restricted in its use to the relationship of blood-brothers,[1] and even among the laity *bhāta* was not used in address, but *tāta* (dear).

With this absence of *bhātar* as a term used in the religious life, it is curious that monks used its opposite, *bhaginī*. But it should be noted that they addressed laywomen as well as nuns as *bhaginī*. Hence the word *bhaginī* is clearly precluded from containing any unique reference to *bhikkhunīs*. Thus the two terms, *bhaginī* and *bhikkhunī* cannot be said to be precisely equivalent in meaning. The latter is applicable to women to whom the former is not applicable. Yet the implication remains, if words mean anything, that monks regarded women as "sisters," while they did not regard men as "brothers." There must be some historical reason for this. I venture to suggest that the celibacy to which the monk was consecrated was answerable for his looking upon women as *bhaginī*. But I am not prepared to say that this is the whole story, although I believe that it may be the root of the matter.[2]

"Friar," although it has the English feminine "friaress," does not appear to me such an acceptable rendering for *bhikkhu* as is "monk." It is true that friars are much more than mendicants or almsmen, as a *bhikkhu* is, or came to be, much more than one who merely begs for alms. When, in the West, mendicancy became symbolic under St. Francis, the friars were to

[1] *E.g.*, at *Thig.* 408; *Jā.* i. 308.

[2] *Cf. S.* iv. 110, where, however, there is also mention of the "mother-mind" and "daughter-mind."

beg, as other poor men. The Sakyan *bhikkhu*, too, had to beg. Yet the growing belief that merit was to be acquired by *giving* in many cases inspired the laity to give before they had been begged. Hence begging did not take such a high place in the duties of Gotama's Order as it did in the West after St. Francis' death; and I doubt if, in India, it was ever symbolic.

On the other hand, "friar," being derived from *frater*, is open to the same general objections as is "brother." Moreover, the Western friar, a later development than the monk, and with the monastic tradition behind him, never aimed at saving himself. He was a brother to the whole world, and went about talking to people at the wayside, to birds and animals; while the prime concern of *bhikkhus*, however much they may have preached, was with the attainment of their own perfection.

Having now considered various arguments for and against mendicant, almsman, brother, friar as translations of *bhikkhu*, I will put forward the reasons which led me to choose "monk" for this term, and "nun" for *bhikkhunī*. It may be that only a profound study of Western Monachism could fully justify or condemn this choice, but from a superficial study it would appear that the similarities between a "monk" and a *bhikkhu* outweigh their differences. These similarities and differences must be judged by the historical associations of the two words. Etymologically they are not connected. Yet in the East and in the West there were these movements, comparable in a general way, though varying in detail, towards ordering and organising religious life in a fashion that necessitated its devotees renouncing their former modes of life and their former worldly pre-occupations.

The two words, monk and *bhikkhu*, are the outcome of certain and definite historical tendencies. Because these did not follow the same course of development in East and West, the two words, although comparable in meaning, are not synonymous. For each is the expression of a particular phase of that development.

If this is borne in mind, if we remember that we are dealing with historical variations of a common tendency, it will seem to us less remarkable that Western terminology offers no equivalent with which the term *bhikkhu* can be made exactly to fit, and more remarkable that a study in comparisons is as possible as it is.

The Western monk, coming into Europe from the East, has, like the Buddhist *bhikkhu,* a long and complicated history, and monks of one century and Order differ considerably from monks of another century and Order. The word monk (*monachus*) is derived from *monos*, meaning "alone." For originally monks abandoned the worldly life for the sake of that solitude in which, by meditation and contemplation, they could attempt to save their souls. Communion with God would enable their souls to be entered by God. Later the outward forms of monkdom changed, and monks came to live a communal life in convents, observing the Rule of the Order which they had entered, and taking the vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. It was the monk's great work to go out into the world so as to save men and to bring men to God. A separate development, a still further change displaced the monk's earlier ideal of finding his own salvation while leading the life of a hermit or anchorite in the desert. Moreover, as monasticism developed, century by century, the early communal poverty gave way to communal plenty. Monasteries became land-owners, monks became cultivators of the soil, makers of various kinds of produce, copyists of manuscripts, storehouses of learning, although by none of these activities was individual property or gain supposed to result.

Now the Buddhist *bhikkhu* did not live alone, but in communities; and there is nothing in the derivation of *bhikkhu* comparable to *monos*. *Bhikkhu*, *bhikṣu* is from the desiderative base of *bhaj*, to beg, to beg alms. On the other hand, he did go into seclusion for meditation during the "day-sojourn" (*divāvihāra*, *cf.* siesta), and sometimes for longer periods he retreated to lonely spots far from the haunts of men. And possibly in

his earlier history, as *bhikṣu*, he was one who lived alone, only gradually coming to live in a community, as the monk came later to lead a cenobitic life. Part of the moral duty of the Buddhist *bhikkhu* was, if he had talent that way, to go forth and give *dhamma* for the sake of *devas* and mankind. In this he resembles certain Orders of Western Monachism which had as their mission the salvation of the world. The early Friars, too, did wayside teaching and preaching, but later this was regulated by authority and made orthodox. Monks, in Gotama's Order, were certainly not segregated, and the Vinaya reveals all manner of intercommunication between the religious and the lay sections of society.

In order to give *dhamma*, the *bhikkhu* had to tour the countryside for nine months in each year. This would also prevent him from being a constant drain on the resources of the laity at any one place. But he was forbidden to travel during the three months of the rains. In this there was nothing similar to the Benedictine "vow of stability," by which a monk undertook to remain permanently at one house. This vow was imposed because wandering ascetics had become a nuisance, whereas Buddhist monks had to stay in one fixed abode for the rains, lest in journeying during this season they should harm the young crops or destroy animal life. A motive such as the latter was far from the thoughts of Western monks, one of whose many activities was to tend the crops and dig the soil. Their view of life did not include a close kinship existing between men and animals, and even the Friars, who spoke to the animals as their "brothers," did not suggest that a man might be undergoing rebirth as an animal (*tiracchāna-gata*).

It may also be supposed that the nine months of touring was made obligatory on a Buddhist monk in order to keep him healthy. The heaviest manual work he did was the washing, bleaching and beating of his robes, and now and again repairs to buildings. This was not because the entrants into the Order were weak, decrepit or sick. It was because the nature of the

beliefs which they held made work on the land impossible for them. In the West, agriculture and all forms of manual labour were regarded as essentials in the main work. They served the further purpose of helping the conquest of the spirit in its perpetual battle with the flesh, and of sharpening and toughening the monks against the vice of *accedia*. The Eastern *bhikkhu* who, on account of the climate, might have been more prone to this was, I think it reasonable to hold, fortified against sloth and indolence by the discomforts of journeying on foot (for the use of vehicles was not allowed), no less than by preaching and by spiritual exercises.

The Buddhist *bhikkhu* has to renounce his worldly possessions before he is ordained, and after his ordination he should own no private property, but should regard his bowl and robe and other requisites as being the communal property of the Order, lent to him for his use. He should lead a life of chastity. He should be obedient to the Pātimokkha courses of training. In these particulars his case closely resembles that of an European monk. But, and here is a great difference between the Western monk and the *bhikkhu*, as understood in the sixth century B.C. in India: there were no vows for a Sakyan *bhikkhu* to take. He did not make any vows, did not bind himself by vows. If he attempted right behaviour, this was because his spiritual training had led to the taming of the self. But where this was of no avail, penalties were inflicted and the discipline was tightened, sometimes in ways which left no loopholes for laxity.

If there were no initial vows, far less were there any "final vows," making a return to life "in the world" extremely difficult, if not impossible. For even after the second ordination ceremony, the upasampadā, a *bhikkhu* was able, if he wished, to "leave the Order," *vibbhamati*, as is the Vinaya word, and to "turn back to the low life of the layman," *hīnāyavattati*, as is the Piṭakan expression. What was binding on the *bhikkhu* was the one rule, the Pātimokkha, under which he

lived, the one training and the one work, as the definition of "in communion" at the end of each Pārājika rule shows, If he was not at one with these, he was defeated and expelled from the Order.

A *bhikkhu* goes for alms, he begs, silently, for alms; he is entirely dependent on the laity for food, robes, lodgings and medicine.. In the great centuries of Western Monachism monks, far from being beggars for alms, were the donors of abundant charity. *Bhikkhus* received alms, they did not give them. If a *bhikkhu* received no *kaṭhina* cloth at the time of its distribution, he wore rags taken from the dust-heap. Moreover, a mark of the *bhikkhu* is that he is one who wears the patchwork cloth (*bhinnapaṭadhara*). For even gifts of robe-material had to be made up, not whole, but in pieces, symbolical of a beggar's rags. The "yellow robes" of a *bhikkhu* are comparable to the Western "habit," the frock and cowl.

In looking for points of contact between "monks" and *bhikkhus*, their relation to the lay-followers might be adduced. In, for instance, a Cistercian abbey the brethren were divided into the monks (*monachi*) and the lay-brothers (*conversi*). The Buddhist Order had its lay-followers. But there, I think, the similarity between the Buddhists and the Cistercians ends. For the Buddhist lay-followers of the faith, in supporting the religious exponents and answering their call of poverty, did not regard them as the means of transmitting their gifts of charity to other needy laity. These gifts were made to and for the *bhikkhus*, and there the matter ended. Nor were the lay-followers organised as were the *conversi*. They did not live in the vihāras and they had no cloistral duties to perform. These were executed by those *bhikkhus* who had been duly appointed to various offices, such as that of food-distributor, assigner of lodgings, robe-distributor, silver-remover, and so forth, offices comparable to those of almoner, kitchener, cellarer of the Western convent, and which in Cistercian abbeys were performed by the *conversi*. The vihāras did not receive laity as guests;

they only received monks from other districts. In Western monasteries the entertainment of lay-visitors was a very important matter.

The wide scope of meaning compressed into the word *bhikkhu* is doubtless an indication that the word was of gradual growth, its significance increasing as the object which it connoted acquired more and more aspects and characteristics. I think the plain historic fact is that originally *bhikkhus* were no more than "men of the scrap-bowl." To this was added, for their greater merit, the meaning of men who, besides living on begged meats, had broken away from this or that undesirable state, and had assumed various distinguishing marks.

In spite of the differences between *bhikkhu* and monk, the affinities between them seem to me marked enough to warrant translating *bhikkhu* as "monk." I have also chosen "monk" for various other reasons. In the first place, in the translations of Pali literature which have already appeared, no less than in several books on Early Buddhism, monk is a rendering that has been commonly adopted for *bhikkhu*. This word, therefore, has some tradition behind it, and hence will not arrest the reader's attention with a sense of unfamiliarity. Secondly, in deciding upon the nearest English equivalent for *bhikkhu*, I had to take into account the fact that an easy feminine form would be required. "Nun" is a very convenient translation for *bhikkhunī*, and has, moreover, equivalents in other European languages. This is not a negligible point when comparing translations. Another reason for the choice of "monk" was that, in the period of Indian history under review, this word necessitates, in the last resort, the drawing of a distinction merely between the Sakyan monk and the Jain monk. Each of the other possible terms—almsman, mendicant, friar[1]—might be applicable to the disciples of other sects; but these could hardly be termed "monks."

[1] "Brother" is hardly possible, as I have tried to show above.

The tremendous growth in the meanings and associations of both "monk" and *bhikkhu* clearly shows that in some cases it is impossible for the history of words to be contained in their etymology. I mention this tendency for words to grow and change, a tendency not of course peculiar to these two terms, simply to remind the reader that etymology is not an infallible guide to the developed meaning of terms. By the time the objects that such terms denote have passed through several phases, their historical meaning, their significance in and for history, may have come to be more than their etymological meaning indicates, different from it, even the very reverse of it. The most that etymology can do in such cases is to point to the meanings that the words once, very likely originally, possessed. This is of undoubted importance. But to translate them according to that meaning, and without a due regard for the known facts of their evolution, would be grossly to neglect the significance that they came to acquire as a result of their historical development.

In rendering *samaṇa* by "recluse" I am adopting what has come to be a fairly usual translation. I am aware that it is a far from happy one. It has no feminine form in English; its connotation of being segregated and living in isolation is misleading. For the Sakyan *samaṇas* were not segregated, in the sense of being confined within the vihāra precincts and forbidden to mix with the laity. They were restricted from following worldly occupations, for it was held that these should be given up when a man or woman went forth from the household state. But the Sakyan *samaṇas* were in no way anchorites or hermits. Nor do I think "ascetic"[1] a particularly suitable rendering. For nowhere is asceticism, as understood in the West, made of importance in Pali literature. The chief asceticism which it recognises is a taming, a training (*damatha*, from the root *dam*), the restraint of evil deeds,

[1] *E.g.*, E. J. Thomas, *History of Buddhist Thought*, 72, 82, 89.

thoughts and words. Thus, although "ascetic" may, etymologically, be more correct than "recluse," unless the Sakyan meaning of asceticism be thoroughly understood, and its Western connotations of bodily mortifications and austerities be dispelled, "recluse" comes nearer to the Pali than does "ascetic." For there were times when the *samaṇas* went into seclusion for meditation. There are, besides, other words in Pali, such as *tāpasa*, literally burning, which more definitely connote an ascetic.

Mrs. Rhys Davids says that "monk" is our nearest word[1] to *samaṇa*, although she also puts forward another word, namely "retreater,"[2] which perhaps is the best in the sense of preserving the history buried in the word *samaṇa*, *śramaṇa*. Doubtless "monk" could have been used for *samaṇa*, had this word not been selected as the most appropriate for *bhikkhu*. For from internal evidence, not only of the Suttavibhaṅga but of other parts of the Canon and the Commentaries,[3] it would appear that the Sakyan *samaṇa* was to all intents and purposes regarded as much the same as the Sakyan *bhikkhu*. The difference came to be more in the name than in the object, and may even have depended more on the person who used the term than on the person of whom it was used. This, in its turn, may depend on some earlier aspects of the history of the two terms.

The word *samaṇa* is not used as a direct form of address in the portion of the Suttavibhaṅga here translated. The brahmin of Verañjā, before he became a lay-follower, does not address Gotama as *samaṇa*, although in speaking to him he uses this word of him (*Vin.* iii. 2=p. 2 below); and Gotama, in this same conversation, is recorded to apply the term to himself.

---

[1] *Birth of Indian Psychology*, p. 185; and *cf.* her *Outlines of Buddhism*, pp. 62, 65.

[2] *Buddhism*, Home Univ. Lib., new edn., p. 198.

[3] Canonical references very frequent. Comys, see, *e.g.*, *AA*. iii. 156 (Siamese edn.), *bhikkhū kaṇhâdhimuttikâ ti samaṇā nām' ete*; and *MA*. ii. 4, where *samaṇas* are explained as those on the four ways to arahantship, thus being identified with *bhikkhus*.

The schismatics also refer to Gotama in this way (*Vin.* iii. 171, 172=pp. 296 ff. below), but not in his presence. Monks are not recorded to address one another in this way, nor do the nuns employ the feminine *samaṇi* (voc.) when speaking to one another, nor the nominative *samaṇī* in speaking of one another. The laity, on the other hand, are sometimes recorded to speak of a particular monk by his personal name, coupled with the appellation *samaṇa*, such as *samaṇa Udāyi* (*Vin.* iii. 120=p. 200 below). They also refer, so it is said, to monks as *samaṇā*, whether they admired them (*Vin.* iii. 119=p. 200 below) or were vexed with them (*Vin.* iii. 120=p. 200 below).

The curious thing is that the negative forms, *asamaṇo*, *asamaṇī*, occur quite often as terms of reproach, and meaning "not a true recluse." On different occasions lay-people and monks are recorded to have reprimanded a monk for his bad behaviour by saying *asamaṇo 'si tvaṃ*, "you are not a (true) recluse." A nun is recorded to have rebuked another nun in the single phrase *asamaṇī 'si tvaṃ*. This was evidently such a serious reproach as to send the person rebuked to Gotama to receive his verdict on the offence committed or imputed, as the case may have been. If the action performed by the monk or nun in question is found by him to be blameworthy, one of the words of censure put into his mouth is always *assāmaṇaka*, "not worthy of a recluse, not belonging to a recluse" (*e.g.*, *Vin.* iii. 24=p. 43 below).

A common designation of the monastic followers of Gotama was *samaṇā Sakyaputtiyā*, recluses (lit. sons of the) Sakyans, or Sakyan recluses. This was also used of them by the laity (*e.g.*, *Vin.* iii. 43, 136, 172=pp. 67, 234, 299 below), including those occasions where the monks had given them cause for complaint (*Vin.* iii. 44, 73, 119=pp. 70, 125, 200 below). In each definition that it gives of *pārājika*, the Old Commentary invariably states that the errant *bhikkhu* is become one who is not a *samaṇa*, not a *Sakyaputtiya*. These two words, *asamaṇa* and *asakyaputtiya*, are sometimes

used together in other passages as terms of abuse (*Vin.* iii. 164 f.=283 below). It may also be noted that, as the monastic disciples of Gotama were called *samaṇā Sakyaputtiyā*, so the followers of Mahāvīra were called, even in the Pali canon,[1] *samaṇā Nigaṇṭhā*, or to be exact, *nigaṇṭhā nāma samaṇajātikā*, a kind of recluse called nigaṇṭhas (Jains).

If the Sakyan *samaṇa* came to correspond with the Sakyan *bhikkhu* on the one side, on the other he came to correspond with *brāhmaṇa*, brahmin, in the meaning of this term as it grew into Sakya, and also into Jainism.[2] For the fact that *samaṇa* often appears in combination with *brāhmaṇa* in Pali canonical literature does not there, I think, necessarily imply any opposition between the two, any more than it does in Jaina literature.[3] According to Professor B. M. Barua,[4] there were various sects or groups or schools of Śramaṇa who broke away from the "later form of Brahmanic religion, superstition and mysticism." So far there was opposition. But by the time that the Sakyaputtiyas were known as *samaṇas*, the term *brāhmaṇa* was also being incorporated into Sakyan usage, and was there receiving a new meaning.

While brahmins as a class remained, brahmins by birth and occupation, brahmins forming sects of ascetics, living by various rules, the word *brāhmaṇa* was developing for Sakya the meaning of the best, the highest person, not because of birth and lineage, but because of spiritual endeavour and attainment. To this, *samaṇa* in public opinion was evidently equivalent. Had not the two words come to have some identity of meaning, not exactly the same things would have been

---

[1] *A.* i. 206.

[2] *Jaina Sūtras*, ii. p. 138 (ed. Jacobi, *S.B.E.* xlv.): "He who has no worldly attachment after entering the Order, who does not repent of having become a monk . . . him we call a Brāhmaṇa." Again at p. 422: "The samaṇas or brāhmaṇas who say thus . . . do not speak as samaṇas or Nigranthas."

[3] *Cf. Jaina Sūtras*, ii. p. 140, and last note.

[4] *Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy*, p. 242. See also p. 237 ff.

said of them both, as is the case in a formula occurring now and again in this part of the Suttavibhaṅga (*e.g.*, *Vin.* iii. 44, 120=pp. 70, 200 below). On the other hand, the words *samaṇa* and *brāhmaṇa* occur in two other sentences at *Vin.* iii. 44, once separated by the disjunctive *vā* (or), once forming a compound. It is possible that some divergence between the two is intended here, as perhaps referring to members of different sects; in which case the two words would not be substitutes or synonyms for one another.[1]

I have left *brāhmaṇa* in its anglicised form of brahmin. The time is perhaps not yet ripe to draw an infallible distinction between brahmins as members of a sect opposed to Sakya, and brahmins as men, as monks, who had attained, or who had failed to attain, some of the ethical attributes and mental development inculcated by Sakya. A verse in the Dhammapada clearly identifies the three, for it ends: *so brāhmaṇo so samaṇo sa bhikkhu* (ver. 142). To differentiate between the Sakyan and non-Sakyan uses of *brāhmaṇa*, as this word occurs in the Pali canon, would be to emphasise the new meaning which, under Sakya, accrued to *brāhmaṇa*, as a word adopted from earlier times.

For there is no doubt that the three terms—*bhikkhu*, *brāhmaṇa* and *samaṇa*—were, in their Sanskrit forms of *bhikṣu*, *brāhmaṇa*, *śramaṇa*, already in the terminology of pre-Sakyan days.[2] Each word will therefore have some pre-Sakyan history, even though this is, in many respects, still obscure. *Brāhmaṇa* is of course a term of enormously long and complicated history, of indisputable antiquity. Professor B. M. Barua says[3] that "śramaṇas became known, perhaps from the practice of begging, as bhikṣus (mendicants)." And referring to a passage in the Aṅguttara Commentary, he further points out that "by the bhikṣus must have been meant

[1] On Samaṇas see B. M. Barua, *loc. cit.*, and Ratilal Mehta, *Asceticism in Pre-Buddhist Days*, Ind. Culture, iii. 4.

[2] *Cf.* interesting Jaina tradition that Mahāvira's parents were followers of the *śramaṇas*, *S.B.E.* xxii., p. 194.

[3] *History of Pre-Buddhist Philosophy*, p. 240.

the members of the fourth Brahmanic order, that is, the Brahmanist ascetics in the fourth stage of efforts and fruitions who are designated Bhikṣu, Yati or Parivrājaka in the Dharma-Sūtras and the Dharma-Sāstras."[1] It is worth while to mention that, according to Jacob's Concordance, in the early Upanisads, *śramaṇa* appears but once,[2] *brāhmaṇa* many times, and *bhikṣu* not at all. *Śramaṇa* occurs, however, in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.

If *bhikkhu* were equivalent in fact to *samaṇa*, and if this were, on some occasions at least, equivalent to the Sakyan usage of *brāhmaṇa*, it is not difficult to see why the life of monks continued to be called *brahmacariya* under Sakya.[3] But as the most suitable translation of *brahma* has still to be decided upon, when it occurs in the compounds *brahmacariya* and *brahmacārin*, I have left it untranslated.

All the same I think there is little doubt that in the words in which Gotama first sent monks out on tour to preach to *devas* and men, *brahmacariya* meant the perfect, the best, the highest life. At some later time it was defined as "refraining from unchastity,"[4] while in another Suttavibhaṅga passage it is defined as "monkdom, *dhamma* of recluses, the aggregates of morality, the quality of austerity."[5] The difficulty is to determine what was meant by the "best life." Whether at one time *brahma*, as part of the compound *brahmacariya*, may not have possessed the deep and essential meaning of the All, the All-Real, the Highest that it possessed in the Upanisadic teaching is as yet a matter of controversy. I find it hard to believe that Sakya arose either in ignorance of this teaching or uninfluenced by it. And even if, as seems highly probable, *brahmacariya* and *brahmacārin* are words taken over by Sakya (and Jainism) from pre-Sakyan sects, it has still

[1] *Maskarī as an Epithet of Gośāla, Ind. Hist. Quart.*, iii. 2, p. 254.

[2] Bṛhad. 4, 3, 22.

[3] See *Dial.* i. 212-215. The word *brahmacārin* occurs once in the Ṛg-Veda in the (later) Maṇḍala, x., ver. 109.

[4] *E.g.*, *Vin.* iii. 133=p. 225 below. *Cf. S.* i. 38.

[5] *Vin.* iii. 164=p. 282 below.

to be established that for these *brahma* did not contain some profound philosophical or religious significance.

Besides *brahmacariya* and *brahmacārin*, I have left untranslated two other words of great importance. These are *dhamma* and *tathāgata*.

Dhamma is a word whose meaning appears to vary in varying contexts. It may mean something like what we should call "conscience," that which should be done, in one passage; the externalised body of doctrine, in another; fashion, act (*etena dhammena*, *Vin.* iii. 133 = p. 225 below), in a third. Mrs. Rhys Davids has written at some length on the meaning of *dhamma* in her later works, to which I now refer the reader.

Anesaki, in his essay on *Tathāgata*,[1] closely connects the notion of *tathāgata* with that of *dhamma*, but he comes no nearer to a conclusive translation of *tathāgata* than do others. For the very ambiguity of its derivation precludes any definitive meaning. This being the case, and because Anesaki has virtually shown that no empirical investigations of the uses of the term can bring us near to a meaning fixed once and for all, we must regard *tathāgata* as a term best left untranslated. I give here four ways in which it might be rendered: (1) the one thus-gone, or thus-going (*tathā-gata*), since *gata* may be taken as a present as well as a past participle; (2) the one thus-come, or thus-coming (*tathā-āgata*); (3) the truth-finder, used by Lord Chalmers in *Further Dialogues*, as the result of empirical considerations; (4) the Way-farer, a rendering suggested by Mrs. Rhys Davids,[2] and used by F. L. Woodward in *Gradual Sayings*, V.[3] In Pali literature the term is not applied exclusively to Gotama himself.

If the meaning of words is liable to vary in different contexts, it is wiser and less misleading not to translate those words until there has been some further advance in Pali criticism and interpretation.

---

[1] *Kataṁ Karanīyam*, Tokyo, 1934, p. 240 ff.

[2] *Sakya*, pp. 67-68, 381; *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 116.

[3] See *G. S.* v. xiii; *Verses of Uplift*, *S.B.B.* viii., p. 81, n. 2.

Deva, *devatā* and *yakkha* are other words that I have not translated. This is partly because the nature of these beings has not yet been fully investigated or established; and partly because the little, we do know of them leads us to suppose that they represent kinds of beings for whom in English there are no acceptable equivalents. For example, in canonical Pali, *devas* are no longer "gods," as they were in the Vedic age; nor are they "angels."[1] Mrs. Rhys Davids has suggested that they were "brave and pious gentlemen who have passed as 'devas' to the next world only to come back one day as men."[2] There is no doubt that these three classes of being are regarded as having a close contact with the world of men. The word *deva* is often coupled with *manussa*, men, people (*e.g.*, *Vin.* iii. 1). The earth-devas are recorded to have heard of Sudinna's lapse, and to have communicated it to the other groups of devas (*Vin.* iii. 18=p. 33 below). It is told how a *devatā* (fem.) belonging to Māra's retinue came and encouraged Migalaṇḍika for having deprived the monks of life (*Vin.* iii. 69=p. 118 below).

Neither do *yakkhas* seem far removed from the human sphere. Words like "fairies, sprites or goblins" do not accord at all well with the Indian way of thinking. There are the predatory *yakkhas* (or *yakkhas* in the form of beasts of prey) who killed some monks, and there is the story of the exorcist monk who deprived a *yakkha* of life (*Vin.* iii. 84=p. 146 below). A monk is recorded to have had sexual intercourse with a *yakkhinī* (*Vin.* iii. 37=p. 56 below), although the Old Commentary does not include this type of being among *mātugāma*, women-kind (*e.g.*, *Vin.* iii. 121=p. 202 below). It defines *mātugāma* as *manussitthi*, human women, and carefully and deliberately excludes *yakkhīs*, *petīs* and female animals.

Where the word *peta*, and the feminine *petī*, occur I have used the translation suggested by Mrs. Rhys

[1] A. Coomaraswamy, *A New Approach to the Vedas*, p. 60 ff.
[2] *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 92.

Davids[1] of "departed one." It appears that *petas*, departed ones, those who have gone on, gone before, were regarded as still endowed with life, and able to speak to men. There is the story of the body, inhabited by the *peta* (*Vin.* iii. 58=p. 97 below), which rose up in the cemetery, by what the Commentary calls "the *peta's* own power," and pursued a monk, asking him not to remove his outer cloak from him. It is also curious that it was thought possible for a monk to commit an offence with *petīs*, and that although an offence committed with *petīs*, *yakkhinīs* and *nāgīs* (female serpents ?) is as grave in nature as one committed with a human woman, these beings are excluded from the Old Commentary's definition of "woman-kind." It almost looks as if a *peta* means one who is quite recently dead, and whose mind and spirit still have power over the body, being not yet entirely dissociated from it.

I think that what emerges most clearly from the Vinaya references to *devas*, *devatās*, *yakkhas* and *petas*, is that there is a non-human world (*cf.* *amanussagāma* at iii. 46=p. 74 below) whose various denizens penetrate the human world and participate in the affairs of men, as their counterparts are thought to do in India, Burma and Ceylon at the present day.

Where names of weights, measures and mediums of exchange occur, I have left them untranslated, and have given notes. All attempts to correlate English words to these would be wholly misleading, and would conjure up a set of wrong ideas.

Amongst the store of incidental knowledge that this part of the Vinaya brings to light, it should be noted that the word *nibbāna* occurs only twice, each time in the same stereotyped formula (iii. 20, 111=pp. 35, 194 below). I have translated it as "waning." Nothing more can be safely deduced from its virtual absence

[1] *Indian Religion and Survival*, p. 35; and *cf.* p. 59.

than the concentration of this portion of the Suttavibhaṅga on outward morality, on forms of behaviour to be regulated and guided by an external standard rather than by an appeal to the inner conscience, the inner morality which, in the India of the sixth century B.C., was held to be immanent in man.

Besides this piece of negative information, a good many positive details, mostly concerning contemporary manners and customs, are brought to light in this part of the Suttavibhaṅga. There is, for example, mention of the punishments that a king could mete out to a thief, while there emerges the very fact that a king meted them out (*Vin.* iii. 46=72, 73 below); mention of some of the kinds of ornaments used (*Vin.* iii. 48, 180=pp. 75 f., 314 below); some of the kinds of games played (*Vin.* iii. 180=p. 316 below); the sort of foodstuffs in common consumption; various kinds of animals, birds, insects, plants and flowers (*Vin.* iii. 48, 49, 52, 58=pp. 79, 80, 87, 98 below); there is mention of the existence of customs' frontiers and customs' houses (*Vin.* iii. 52, 62=pp. 86, 104 below); smuggling, kidnapping of children, the kind of treatment given by monks to their ill comrades; there is evidence for the belief that trees may be inhabited by conscious beings; and there is the indication that Indians, then as now, appear to have no difficulty in dying at will. I have nothing to add to Rhys Davids' and Oldenberg's remarks on the knowledge and use of writing[1] at the time of the compilation of the Vinaya.

The following authorities, including the late Professor E. J. Rapson, kindly helped me on the difficult point of finding a translation for the term *bhikkhu*; their letters were most interesting, while showing a considerable diversity of opinion. I have much pleasure in tendering my thanks to all their writers: to Professor J. Przyluski, Mrs. Rhys Davids, Professor Otto Schrader, Professor Helmer Smith and Professor F. W. Thomas. Above all, I should like to express my gratitude to my

[1] *Vin. Texts*, i. xxii ff.

friend, Miss A. M. Cooke, for her illuminating conversations on the Western monk. It remains for me to thank, especially and most sincerely, Mrs. Rhys Davids for entrusting the translation of the Vinaya to me, for her many rewarding suggestions, and for the help that she has generously bestowed upon the preparation of this volume.

An asterisk in the text denotes that the word or passage beside which it appears is given in full in Pali in the Appendix.

The page numbers, given in square brackets in the text, and corresponding to Oldenberg's page numbers of his edition of the *Vinayapiṭaka*, are placed, not at the beginning of the pages to which the translation corresponds, but at the end. This has been done in order to introduce a certain consistency, for all Vinaya numbering—of section, sub-section and paragraph—is placed at the end.

I. B. HORNER.

MANCHESTER, 1938.

EDITORIAL NOTE

At the translator's request I say here a few words. Words of valediction for a work which is a genuine labour of love. Result though it be of strenuous, unfaltering research, the translation of an ancient thesaurus of monastic legality, as is the Pali Vinaya Piṭaka, is not of the class we call "best seller." Labour and printing costs have been alike undertaken by my friend and colleague, the translator. And I am not a little proud to think that a book which my husband helped, in his early efforts, to bring in part before European readers, should now receive my blessing in its first complete form after this interval of over half a century.

It may interest some to learn, as to that translation in part, how the two translators divided the work. For living in different countries, each translating in his leisure moments, there seems to have been (more's the pity!) very little if any collaboration. No correspondence survives revealing that any took place. On the fly-leaf of Vol. I. of *Vinaya Texts, Sacred Books of the East*, XIII., there stands in Rhys Davids' handwriting the following: "Of the work I have translated the

Pātimokkha i. 1-90.
Mahāvagga v. and vi. 22; ii, 1-81. 80 pp.
vi. 32—vii. 3. 43 pp.
viii. 12-32. 49 pp.
Cullavagga i.-iii. 120 pp.
iv. 1-12 (the whole volume). 440 pp.
Total: 800 pp. out of 1230 pp.

The rest, as is well known, was the work of that fastidiously careful scholar, Hermann Oldenberg."

As she has stated in her Introduction, Isaline Horner begins her translation at the beginning, as Oldenberg did

not, in his edition of the Pali text, published shortly before the birth of the Pali Text Society. The *S.B.E.* translation was a large selection, not the complete work.

In the Vinaya, taking it by and large, we have the records of a great effort, put forth by the culture of North India during the sixth to the third century B.C., to "get rich quickly" in things, not of worldly experience, but of man's spiritual fortune. The idea, in monasticism, was that the man, in striving to become a More than his worldly fellows, could best do so by making his life here a Less. By cutting out a great part of what our poets have called "life in the whole," it was judged he would, by living a simplified remainder, progress much faster. Progress, that is, towards that waning out of repeated spans of life as he knew it here, or heard of it in the next world or worlds.

This is surely to misunderstand life as we find it. An enemy army is not conquered by its being attacked in one section only. The monk admitted that he bore his enemy about with him in body and mind. And to shelter body and mind from opportunities of efforts towards a Better, such as life in its fulness alone could afford, was no sound method of seeking to grow. Man is but a less if he shirk much of life. Not along such lines does the Hand draw him which

au fond de l'idéal fait signe.

It is doubtless true that the withdrawn life is not only good at times, but may, there or then, be necessary for the student. But I do not find this need expressing itself in Buddhist monastic literature as a motive for leaving the world. I may be wrong, and shall welcome correction. For the history of monasticism, especially of monasticism in what was perhaps its cradle, has yet to be written. And a complete translation of the Vinaya Piṭaka will bring such a work nearer the day when it can be written.

C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS.

CONTENTS



Vinayapiṭaka

SUTTAVIBHAṄGA (PĀRĀJIKA)

PRAISE TO THE LORD, THE PERFECTED ONE, THE FULLY ENLIGHTENED

DEFEAT (PĀRĀJIKA) I

AT one time[1] the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Verañjā[2] near Naḷeru's Nimba tree[3] with a great company of five hundred monks. A brahmin[4] of Verañjā heard: Verily, good sir,[5] the recluse[6] Gotama, son of the Sakyans,[7] having gone forth from the Sakyan clan, is staying at Verañjā near Naḷeru's Nimba tree with a great company of five hundred monks. The highest praise[8] has gone forth concerning the lord Gotama: he is indeed lord, perfected one,[9] fully enlightened, endowed with knowledge and conduct, well-farer, knower of the worlds, unrivalled trainer of men to be tamed, teacher of devas and mankind, the enlightened

---

[1] From here to end of || 1 || *cf. A.* iv. 173-179.

[2] Quoted at *DA.* i. 12. *VA.* 108 merely says that Verañjā was the name of a town. It is mentioned again at *A.* iv. 172, 197. At *A.* ii. 57 it is said that Gotama was "journeying along the highroad between Madhurā and Verañjā." For Madhurā on the Jumna see *Buddhist India*, p. 36; *C.H.I.* i. 316. *M. Sta.* 42 says that Gotama addressed some brahmins and householders from Verañjā at Sāvatthī.

[3] *VA.* 108 says that here the yakkha is called Naḷeru, that *pucimanda* is the nimba-tree (Azadirachta Indica), and that *mūlaŋ* is *samīpaŋ*. *Cf. Pucimandajātaka, Jā.* iii., p. 33.

[4] *VA.* 111, *mātāpitūhi katanāmavasena paṇḍyam Udayo ti vuccati.*

[5] See Intr., p. xxxviii.

[6] See Intr., p. l *ff.*

[7] *Sakyaputta*, lit. son of the Sakyan (s), but a Pali idiom meaning simply "a Sakyan."

[8] *Cf. D.* i. 87.

[9] *Arahan.*

one, the lord. Having brought to fulfilment his own powers of realisation, he makes known this world, together with devas including the Māras, and the Brahmās; creatures, together with recluses and brahmins, together with devas and men. He teaches dhamma, lovely at the beginning, lovely at the middle and lovely at the ending. He explains with the spirit and the letter the Brahma-life completely fulfilled and wholly pure. Good indeed it were to see perfected men like that.[1] ||1||

Then the brahmin of Verañjā came up to the lord, and having come up he exchanged friendly greetings with the lord, and having exchanged friendly greetings he sat down [1] to one side. As he was sitting to one side, the brahmin of Verañjā spoke thus to the lord:

"I have heard, good[2] Gotama, that the recluse Gotama does not greet brahmins who are worn, old, stricken in years, who have lived their span and are at the close of their life[3]; nor does he stand up or ask them to sit down. Likewise, good Gotama, that the revered[4] Gotama does not greet brahmins who are worn, old, stricken in years, who have lived their span and are at the close of their life; nor does he greet them or stand up or ask them to sit down. Now this, good Gotama, this is not respectful."[5]

"Brahmin, I do not see him in the world of devas including the Māras, including the Brahmās, including recluses and brahmins, of creatures including devas and mankind, whom I should greet or rise up for or to whom I should offer a seat. For, brahmin, whom a tathāgata

[1] All this is stock.

[2] *Bho.* This is the vocative, sing. and plur., of *bhavant.* See Intr., p. xxxviii.

[3] Also stock; *cf.*, *e.g.*, *M.* i. 82, *Sn.* 50, 92; *Vin.* ii. 188.

[4] *Bhavaṃ.*

[5] *Na sampannaṃ eva.* *VA.* 130 *taṃ abhivādanādīnaṃ akaraṇaṃ ayuttaṃ eva.* Similar passages are at *A.* i. 67 (*AA.* *na yuttaṃ eva, na anucchavikaṃ eva*). Translator at *G.S.* i. 63 says "the idea here is 'not the perfect gentleman' or 'bad form.'" See also *A.* iii. 223; iv. 173.

should greet or rise up for or offer a seat to, his head would split asunder."[1] || 2 ||

"The revered[2] Gotama is without the quality of taste,"[3] he said.

"There is indeed, brahmin, a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: The recluse Gotama is without the quality of taste. For, brahmin, tastes for forms, tastes for sounds, tastes for scents, tastes for savours, tastes for tangible objects—these have been destroyed by the tathāgata, cut off at the root like a palm-tree, they are so utterly done away with that they are not able to come into future existence. This, brahmin, is a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: The recluse Gotama is without the quality of taste. But surely you did not mean that;" he said.

"The revered Gotama is without enjoyment,"[4] he said.

"There is indeed, brahmin, a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: The recluse Gotama is without enjoyment. For, brahmin, enjoyments of forms, enjoyments of sounds, enjoyments of scents, enjoyments of savours, enjoyments of tangible objects—these have been destroyed by the tathāgata, cut off at the root like a palm-tree, they are so utterly done away with that they are not able to come into future existence. This,

---

[1] *muddhâpi tassa vipateyya.* Bu. explains at *VA.* 131: "the head of that man (*tassa puggalassa*) having been cut off from the neck, may it fall to the ground." Same phrase occurs at *D.* i. 143; iii. 19; *Dhp.* 72.

Cf. Jā. v. 33, *muddhâpi tassa vipphaleyya sattadhā*, with v. 11: *vipa-*, *vipha-* and *phaleyyuṃ*. *Cf. Jā.* v. 493, *muddhā me sattadhā phaleyya* ('perhaps the best reading'—*P.E.D.*), and *ibid.*, *muddhâpi tassa vipateyya sattadhā*.

[2] *Bhavaṃ.*

[3] *Arasarūpa.* *VA.* 131 takes this to mean lack of good manners. Gotama is said not to show complete taste, which consists in paying reverence, making salutation, getting up from the seat and making a respectful greeting. *Cf. Tait. Up.* ii. 7.

[4] *Nibbhoga*, or "property," as at *G.S.* iv. 118. *VA.* 134 says that greeting the aged is *sāmaggiparibhoga.*

brahmin, is a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: The recluse Gotama is without enjoyment. But surely you did not mean that."

"The revered Gotama professes the doctrine of non-action,"[1] he said.

"There is indeed, brahmin, a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: The recluse Gotama professes the doctrine of non-action. For I, brahmin, teach the non-doing of offences of body, speech and thought. I teach the non-doing of manifold evil and wrong states. This indeed, brahmin, is a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: The recluse Gotama professes the doctrine of non-action. But surely you did not mean that."

"The revered Gotama professes the doctrine of annihilation,"[2] he said.

"There is indeed, brahmin, a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: The recluse Gotama professes the doctrine of annihilation. For I, brahmin, speak of the annihilation of passion, of hatred and of confusion[3]; I speak of the annihilation of manifold evil and wrong states. This indeed, brahmin, is a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: The recluse Gotama professes the doctrine of annihilation. [2] But surely you did not mean that."

"The revered Gotama is one who detests,"[4] he said.

"There is indeed, brahmin, a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: The recluse Gotama is one who detests. For I, brahmin, detest offences of

[1] For this passage to end of || 3 ||, *cf. Vin.* i. 234-236 and *A.* iv. 180 ff., in both of which Gotama is represented as speaking with the General Sīha. The theory of non-action is usually attributed to Pūraṇa Kassapa, as at *D.* i. 52 f. The theory of *kiriyavādin* and *akiriyavādin* is also stated at *A.* i. 62.

[2] *Ucchedavāda,* or cutting off. *Cf. D.* i. 34. Rhys Davids refers to *Kaṭha Up.* i. 20, where the doubt as to whether, after a man is dead, he exists or not, is also voiced by Naciketas. *Cf.* also *M.* ii. 228.

[3] *Cf. S.* iv. 252, definition of *nibbāna.*

[4] *Jegucchī,* one who loathes, or feels abhorrence. See *Dial.* i. 237, n. 2, and *cf. M.* i. 77, 78.

body, speech and thought, and the coming into[1] manifold evil and wrong states. This indeed, brahmin, is a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: The recluse Gotama is one who detests. But surely you did not mean that."

"The revered Gotama is restrained,"[2] he said.

"There is indeed, brahmin, a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: The recluse Gotama is restrained. For I, brahmin, teach dhamma for the restraint of passion, of hatred and of confusion; I teach dhamma for the restraint of manifold evil and wrong states. This indeed, brahmin, is a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: The recluse Gotama is restrained. But surely you did not mean that."

"The revered Gotama is one who practises austerities,"[3] he said.

"There is indeed, brahmin, a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: The recluse Gotama is one who practises austerities. For I, brahmin, speak of evil, wrong states which are searing,[4] of offences of body, speech and thought. He who, brahmin, has destroyed the searing, evil, wrong states, having cut them off at the root like a palm-tree, who has done away with them so utterly that they can come to no future existence—him I call one who practises austerities. The tathāgata, brahmin, has destroyed the searing, evil, wrong states,

---

[1] *Samāpatti.*

[2] *Venayika. VA.* 135 says that the brahmin did not see the lord paying reverence and so forth, and said that he restrained these acts with regard to the "highest in the world," therefore he thought him one to be restrained, one to be suppressed. At *M.* i. 140 Gotama is represented as telling the monks that he is charged with being *venayika.* It here seems to mean annihilationist, for it is combined with: "he preaches the disintegration, the destruction and annihilation of existing creatures." But as translator (*G.S.* iv. 119, n. 4) remarks, we have *natthika* and *ucchedavāda* for nihilist and annihilationist. See *loc. cit.* for valuable remarks, and *A.* v. 190.

[3] *Tapassī,* connected with *tapas,* lit. burnt up. It can also mean "one who has his senses under control."

[4] *tapanīyā ; cf. A.* i. 49 and "should be mortified" at *G.S.* iv. 120.

has cut them off at the root like a palm-tree, has done away with them so utterly that they can come to no future existence. This indeed, brahmin, is a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: The recluse Gotama is one who practises austerities. But surely you did not mean that."

"The revered Gotama is not destined to another (kind of) becoming,"[1] he said.

"There is indeed, brahmin, a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: The recluse Gotama is one who is not destined to another (kind of) becoming. Indeed, brahmin, he whose future conception in a womb, whose rebirth in a future becoming are destroyed and cut off like a palm-tree at the root, are so utterly done away with that they can come to no future existence—him I call one not destined to another becoming. The tathāgata's future conception in a womb, his rebirth in a new becoming, are destroyed and cut off at the root like a palm-tree, are so utterly done away with that he can come to no future existence. This indeed, brahmin, is a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: The recluse Gotama is one not destined to another becoming. But surely you did not mean that." || 3 ||

"Brahmin, it is like a hen[2] with eight or ten or twelve eggs on which she has sat properly, properly warmed and properly hatched; is that chick which should win forth safely, having first of all pierced through the egg-shell with the point of the claw on its foot, or with its beak, to be called the eldest or the youngest?" he said.

"He is to be called the eldest, good Gotama, for he is the eldest of these," he said.

"Even so I, brahmin, having pierced through the shell of ignorance for the sake of creatures going in ignorance, born of eggs, [3] covered over, am

[1] *apagabbha*. *VA*. 136, the brahmin says that Gotama is either destined to be reborn again in a mother's womb or not to arise in a deva-world.

[2] *Cf. M*. i. 104.

unique[1] in the world, utterly enlightened with unsurpassed enlightenment.[2] I myself, brahmin, am the world's eldest[3] and highest.[4] || 4 ||

Brahmin,[5] I had steadily put forth energy, clear mindfulness had arisen, my body was quieted and calm, my mind was composed and one-pointed. I, brahmin, aloof from pleasures of the senses, aloof from wrong states of mind, having attained the first musing with its reflection and investigation that is born of solitude, zestful and easeful, abided therein. By the mastery of reflection and investigation, having inner faith, the mind become concentrated,[6] without reflection, without investigation, having attained the second musing that is born of contemplation, zestful and easeful, I abided therein. By the fading out of zest, I dwelt poised, mindful and attentive, and I experienced welfare as to the body, attaining the third musing which the noble ones describe in these terms: "he who is poised and mindful dwells happily," I abided therein. By the rejection of ease[7] and by the rejection of discomfort,[7] by the annihilation of the rejoicing and the sorrowing I had before, having attained to that state which is neither pleasant nor painful, that utter purity of mindfulness which is poised, which is the fourth musing, I abided therein.[8] || 5 ||

Then with the mind collected, clarified, purified, flawless, void of taints, grown soft and pliable, fixed and

---

[1] *eko=eko adutiyo*, *VA*. 139.

[2] *VA*. 139=*MA*. i. 54, *bodhī ti maggo . . . bodhī ti vuccati catusu maggesu ñāṇaŋ*.

[3] *VA*. 140, on account of being the first-born among ariyas. In *VA*. 165 ariyas are defined as Buddhas, paccekabuddhas, and the disciples of Buddhas.

[4] *Cf. D*. ii. 15, *aggo, jeṭṭho, seṭṭho*.

[5] This passage to end of || 8 || below=*M*. i. 21-23, but *M*. omits the simile of the chick.

[6] *ekodibhāva*.

[7] Expl. by *Comy*. to mean bodily ease and bodily discomfort.

[8] *Cf. A*. i. 53; *S*. v. 318.

come to utter peace,[1] I directed the mind[2] towards the knowledge of the memory of former becomings; thus I remember divers former becomings; that is to say, one birth,[3] two births, three births, four births, five births, ten births, twenty births, thirty births, forty births, fifty births, a hundred births, a thousand births, a hundred thousand births, and many an æon of disintegration of the world, and many an æon of its redintegration[4] and many æons of both its disintegration and redintegration: such a one was I by name, having such and such a clan, having such and such a colour,[5] so was I nourished, such and such easeful and painful experiences were mine, so did the span of life end. Passing from this, I came to be in another state where such a one was I by name, having such and such a clan, having such and such a colour, so was I nourished, such easeful and painful experiences were mine, so did the span of life end. Passing from this, I came to be here, thus I remember divers former becomings in all their modes and in detail. This, brahmin, was the first knowledge attained by me in the first watch of that night[6]; ignorance was dispelled, knowledge arose, darkness was dispelled, light arose, even as I abided zealous, ardent, with a self that has striven.[7] This was, brahmin, my first

---

[1] *Vin.* iii. 4; *M.* i. 22, read *āṇañjappatte* with v. 11; *A.* ii. 211; *D.* i. 76; *M.* i. 182 all read *āṇejjappatte.* This passage to end of ||8|| below=*M.* i. 22-23=i. 182-183, except that these omit the simile of the chick.

[2] *Cf. A.* ii. 211; *D.* i. 76 ff.

[3] *Cf. S.* ii. 122.

[4] I follow Lord Chalmers' trans. at *Fur. Dial.* i. 15, for, although it is not perfect, it gives the idea that the process is eternally repeated. *K.S.* ii. 86 reads " æon of involution . . . of evolution "; *G.S.* iv. 121, " rolling on and rolling back "; *G.S.* ii. 145, " rolling up and rolling back." The brahmanic idea is that as Viṣṇu sleeps on the giant cobra, he dreams the world; this is its out-rolling, its coming to be. When he awakes the world falls into nothingness, it is withdrawn, until the god sleeps and dreams again.

[5] *VA.* 160, *evaṃvaṇṇo ti odāto vā sāmo vā.*

[6] See *Fur. Dial.* i. 15, n. 1 for this night being occupied with the " chain of causation," as at *Vin.* i. 1.

[7] *pahitatta*; see Mrs. Rhys Davids, *The Birth of Indian Psychology,* etc., p. 295.

successful breaking forth, like a chick's from the egg-shell. ‖ 6 ‖

Then with the mind collected, clarified, purified, flawless, void of taints, grown soft and pliable, fixed and come to utter peace, I directed the mind towards the knowledge of the arising and passing hence of beings; [4] so that with the purified deva-vision surpassing that of men, I behold beings, I know beings as they pass away or come to be—mean, excellent, fair, foul, in a good bourn,[1] in a bad bourn[1] according to their actions, and I think: Indeed, those worthies[2] whose deeds were evil, whose speech was evil, whose thoughts were evil, abusers of the noble ones, holders of wrong views, incurring[3] the actions[3] of wrong views—these at the breaking up of the body after death, have arisen in the waste, the bad bourn, the abyss, hell. Indeed, those good sirs[2] whose deeds were good, whose speech was good, whose thoughts were good, who did not abuse the noble ones, holding right views, incurring the actions of right views—these at the breaking up of the body after death, have arisen in the good bourn, the heaven-world. Thus with purified deva-vision surpassing that of men, do I behold beings, I know beings as they pass away and come to be—mean, excellent, fair, foul, in a good bourn, in a bad bourn according to their actions.[4] This, brahmin, was the second knowledge attained by me in the middle watch of that night. Ignorance was dispelled, knowledge arose, darkness was dispelled, light arose, even as I abided zealous, ardent, with a self that has striven. This was, brahmin, my second successful breaking forth, like a chick's from the egg-shell. ‖ 7 ‖

Then[5] with the mind collected, clarified, purified,

[1] *VA.* 164, *sugate ti sugatigate . . . duggate ti duggatigate*, lit. gone to a good bourn, etc.; or, in a good bourn, etc. [2] *Bhonto.*

[3] *kammasamādāna*, trans. at *G.S.* iii. 295, "action's moulding," and at *G.S.* iv. 122, "men who have acquired this karma."

[4] This passage=*S.* ii. 122 f.

[5] For this passage *cf. A.* ii. 211; *M.* i. 23; *M.* iii. 36.

flawless, void of taints, grown soft and pliable, fixed and come to utter peace, I directed the mind towards the knowledge of the destruction of the cankers. I knew as it really is: This is ill, this is the arising of ill, this is the stopping of ill, this is the course leading to the stopping of ill. I knew as it really is: These are the cankers, this is the arising of the cankers, this is the stopping of the cankers, this is the course leading to the stopping of the cankers. In me, thus knowing, thus seeing, my mind was freed from the canker of sensual pleasures, my mind was freed from the canker of becoming, my mind was freed from the canker of false views, my mind was freed from the canker of ignorance.[1] (To me) freed, came knowledge[2] through the freedom: I knew: Destroyed is rebirth, lived is the Brahma-life, done is what was to be done, there is no beyond for this state of things.[3] This was, brahmin, the third knowledge attained by me in the third watch of that night. Ignorance was dispelled, knowledge arose, darkness was dispelled, light arose, even as I abided zealous, ardent, with a self that has striven.[4] This was, brahmin [5] my third successful breaking forth, like a chick's from the egg-shell." || 8 ||

When he had spoken thus, the brahmin of Verañjā said to the lord:

"The revered Gotama is the first-born, the revered Gotama is the best. Wonderful, good Gotama, wonderful, good Gotama. As a man, good Gotama, might set upright what had been overturned, or reveal what had been hidden, or tell a man who had gone astray which was his way, or bring a lamp into the darkness so that those with eyes to see might see the things about them —even so, good Gotama, in many a figure has the good

[1] These are the four *āsavā*. At *M*. i. 23 and *A*. ii. 211, iv. 179 only three *āsavas* are mentioned.

[2] *Cf*. *G.S*. ii. 225, n. 2; *G.S*. iv. 123.

[3] One of the formulæ of arahantship.

[4] To here from || 5 || above=*M*. i. 21-23 (and *cf*. *M*. i. 182-3).

Gotama made dhamma clear. To the lord[1] Gotama I go for refuge, and to dhamma and to the Order of monks. May the revered Gotama accept me as a lay follower, as one gone for refuge, from this day forth while life lasts.[2] May the revered Gotama consent to spend the rains at Verañjā together with the company of monks." The lord consented by his silence. Then the brahmin of Verañjā having gained the lord's consent, rose from his seat, and saluting the lord, departed, keeping his right side towards him. || 9 || **1** ||

At that time Verañjā[3] was short of almsfood,[4] which was difficult to obtain; it was suffering from famine, and food tickets were issued. Nor was it easy to keep oneself going[5] by gleaning or by favour. At that time some horse-dealers of Uttarāpathaka[6] arrived at the

---

[1] Here *bhagavantaṃ*; at *A.* iv. 179 *bhavantaṃ*.

[2] *Vin.* i. 236; *M.* i. 24, 488 f., etc., for this stock passage. To here, from beginning of this Pārājika, *cf. A.* iv. 173-179.

[3] Burlingame, *Buddhist Legends*, ii. 193, says that Jātaka 183 is derived from this Vinaya story; and that the *Comy.* on *Dhp.* 83 is derived from this Jātaka; *cf. DhA.* ii. 153 ff.

[4] *Cf.* below Pār. I. **5**, 5; Pār. IV. **1**, 1.

The meaning of these four stock-phrases is doubtful: (1) Short of almsfood = *dubbhikkhā*; may also mean: (suffering from) famine. *VA.* 174, *dullabhikkhā*, almsfood (was) hard to get. (2) Difficult to obtain = *dvīhitikā*; may also mean: crops were bad. See art. in *P.E.D.* (3) Suffering from famine = *setaṭṭhikā*; may also mean: i. (strewn with) white bones, ii. mildew. So trans. at *Vin. Texts* iii. 326 (*Vin.* ii. 256), where this word used in simile = *A.* iv. 279, trans. *G.S.* iv. 185 (see *ibid.* n. 2), "white-as-bones" (disease). (4) Food tickets were issued = *salākāvuttā*; may also mean: people subsisted on blades of grass. *VA.* 175 gives both meanings. *G.S.* i. 142 = *A.* i. 160: grown to mere stubs. At *A.* i. 24 Kuṇḍadhāna is called "chief among those who are the first to receive a food ticket" (*G.S.* i. 18). *AA.* i. 260 f. apparently refers to a food ticket. *Cf. VA.* 174 f., *AA.* ii. 257, *SA.* iii. 106. Also *G.S.* i. 142, *K.S.* iv. 228 (= *A.* i. 160, *S.* iv. 323) and their notes.

[5] *yāpetuṃ*. *Cf.* description of Vesālī in opposite terms at *Vin.* i. 238.

[6] Probably meaning Northern India, see B. C. Law, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, p. 48. At *Jā.* ii. 287 five hundred horse-dealers from Uttarāpatha are mentioned. Also a certain dealer had five hundred horses.

rains-residence of Verañjā with five hundred horses. In the horse-rings[1] they prepared *pattha* measure after *pattha* measure of steamed grain[2] for the monks. The monks rising early and taking their bowls and robes, entered Verañjā for almsfood. But being unable to obtain almsfood, they went into the horse-rings for almsfood. Having brought the *pattha* measures of steamed grain back to the park, they pounded them and ate them. The venerable Ānanda, having crushed a *pattha* measure of the steamed grain on a stone, took it to the lord and the lord ate it. Then the lord heard the sound of the mortar. Now tathāgatas (sometimes) ask knowing,[3] and knowing (sometimes) do not ask; they ask, knowing the right time (to ask), and they ask, knowing the right time (when not to ask). Tathāgatas

---

[1] *Assamaṇḍalika. VA.* 176 says: "Not being able to journey during the four rainy months in this district, they built outside the city in a place not submerged by water, sleeping quarters (*vāsâgara*) for themselves and stables (*mandira*) for the horses, encircled by a fence."

[2] *patthapatthamūlaka*=*DhA.* ii. 154, where n. 4 gives Fausböll's reading, *pattan thūlakaŋ*. In my copy of Fausböll's edition of the *Dhp.*, which was formerly Trenckner's, Trenckner has altered this reading to *patthaŋ mūlakaŋ*. *VA.* 176 reads °*pulakaŋ* with *v.l. mūlakaŋ*. *Pattha* is a measure of a certain capacity. See Rhys Davids, *Ancient Coins*, etc., pp. 18-20. At *VA.* 176 it is said: *pattho nāma nāḷimattaŋ*. *Nāḷimattaŋ* would seem to mean as much as a tube or hollow stalk holds; trans. at *G.S.* ii. 210 "root-fibres." *SnA.* 476 says *cattāro patthā āḷhakaŋ*, an *āḷhaka* being another measure; thus one *pattha*=¼ *āḷhaka*. At *DhA.* ii. 70; *PvA.* 283 and *Jā.* i. 419 *pattha* is used of *ajalaṇḍika*, put down a bad monk's throat.

Bu. says, *VA.* 176, that a *pattha* measure of *pulaka* was prepared for each monk, the horse-dealers saying, "What if we were now to take a *pattha* measure from the morning meal of each horse and give it to each monk. Thus they will not suffer and the horses will be kept going." Bu. says, *pulakaŋ nāma nitthusan katvā ussedetvā gahitayavataṇḍulā vuccanti*, which would seem to mean: "having done away with the husk and having steamed it—*pulaka* is the name of barley and rice husked and taken after steaming" = steamed—*i.e.*, rice ready for boiling.

Ussedeti is not given in *P.T.S. Dict.*, but *sedeti* is given as causative of *sijjati*, to heat, to steam.

[3] =*Vin.* i. 158=*Vin.* iii. 88-89 below.

ask about what belongs to the goal,[1] not about what does not belong to the goal; the breaking of the bridge[2] of the tathāgatas is among what does not belong to the goal. The enlightened ones, the lords, question the monks concerning two matters, either: "Shall we teach dhamma?" or, "Shall we declare the course of training for the disciples?" Then the lord addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying:

"What, Ānanda, is this sound of a mortar?"

Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord. [6]

"It is good, Ānanda. Ānanda, those who come after[3] will disdain the meaty boiled rice and the gruel won[4] by you who are men indeed."[5] || 1 ||

Then the venerable Moggallāna the Great[6] came up to the lord, and having come up he greeted the lord and sat down to one side. As he was sitting to one side, the venerable Moggallāna the Great spoke thus to the lord:

"At present, lord,[7] Verañjā is short of almsfood,

---

[1] *Attha*, in Sakya the positive goal. The translators of *Vin.* i. 158 at *Vin. Texts*, i. 327 translate *atthasaṁhita* as "full of sense," thus taking *attha* (quite unnecessarily) in its later, debased and narrowed meaning. The negative word *anattha* appears at *Vin.* i. 10 in the First Utterance, the positive form being there absent. See *G.S.* iv., vii. and xix.

[2] *Setughāta*. *VA*. 180 says *setu vuccati maggo*. Thus if we follow Bu. in this interpretation of *setughāta*, the rendering "the bridge is pulled down for the Tathāgatas" of *Vin. Texts*. i. 327 must be given up. *Cf. A.* i. 220, where it seems to mean the breaking down of new actions; and *cf. A.* i. 260; ii. 145; *Dhs.* 299 ff.

[3] *Pacchimā janatā*. *VA*. 181 says *anāgate*; also that they will be sitting in the vihāra, getting food easily, but feeling nothing but contempt for it as being not to their liking. *Cf.* below, p. 66.

[4] *Vijitaṃ*, also meaning conquered, subdued. *VA*. 180 says *dubbhikkhaṃ vijitaṃ lobho vijito icchācāro vijito*.

[5] *Sappurisa*. On prefix *sa-* see Mrs. Rhys Davids, Intr. to *G.S.* i. ix f.

[6] Generally paired with Sāriputta. At *A.* i. 23 he is called chief among the disciples who have psychic power. *Cf. Vin.* i. 39; *Breth.* 382 ff.

[7] *Bhante*.

which is difficult to obtain. It is suffering from a famine and food-tickets are being issued. Nor is it easy to keep oneself going by gleaning or by favour. Lord, the under surface of this great earth is fertile, even as a flawless honey-comb.[1] Good it were, lord, if I were to invert the earth,[2] so that the monks might enjoy the nutritive essence of the water-plants."

"But what will you do with those creatures, Moggallāna, who are supported by the earth?"

"Lord, I will make one of my hands broad, like the great earth, and I will make those creatures who are supported by the earth pass over thence. Then with the other hand I will invert the earth."

"Take care, Moggallāna, please do not invert the earth, or beings may meet with derangement."[3]

"It is well, lord, the whole order of monks may go to Uttarakuru[4] for alms."

"Take care, Moggallāna, let not the going of the whole order of monks to Uttarakuru for alms seem good to you." ||2||**2**||

Now while the venerable Sāriputta[5] had gone into seclusion for meditation, this thought arose in his mind: "Of which enlightened ones, of which lords, did the Brahma-life not last long? Of which enlightened ones, of which lords did the Brahma-life last long?" Then the venerable Sāriputta, rising up at evening time from his meditation, came up to the lord and having come up he greeted the lord and sat down to one side. As he was sitting to one side, the venerable Sāriputta spoke thus to the lord:

---

[1] For this simile *cf. D.* iii. 87.

[2] *VA.* 182 explains: so as to turn up the lowest level to the top.

[3] *Vipallāsa*, from *vi+pari+as*, lit. to throw round against.

[4] B. C. Law in his *Geography of Early Buddhism*, pp. 17, 53, says that Uttarakuru "is alluded to in Pāli literature as a mythical region."

[5] Usually paired with Moggallāna. See *Pss. Breth.*, p. 340. At *A.* i. 23 he is called chief among the disciples "of great wisdom."

" Now, lord, as I was in seclusion for meditation, this thought arose in my mind: 'Of which enlightened ones . . . last long ?' "

" Sāriputta, while Vipassin[1] was lord, while Sikhin[1] was lord, and while Vessabhu[1] was lord the Brahma-life did not last long. Sāriputta, while Kakusandha[2] was lord and while Konāgamana[2] was lord and while Kassapa[2] was lord [7] the Brahma-life lasted long." || 1 ||

" And what, Lord, is the cause, what the reason why when Vipassin was lord and when Sikhin was lord and when Vessabhu was lord the Brahma-life did not last long ?"

" Sāriputta, the lord Vipassin and the lord Sikhin and the lord Vessabhu were idle in preaching dhamma in detail to the disciples; and these had little of the Suttas[3] in prose or in prose and verse, the Expositions, the Songs, the Verses of Uplift,[4] the Quotations, the Jātakas, the Miracles, the Miscellanies[5]; the course of training for the disciples was not made known, the Pāṭimokkha was not appointed. After the disappearance of these enlightened ones, these lords, after the disappearance[6] of the disciples enlightened under these enlightened ones,[7] those last disciples of various

[1] Some of the 24 Buddhas. For Sikhin see *S.* i. 155 ff., and for all three *Jā.* i. 4 ff., *D.* ii. 2 ff.

[2] The last three Buddhas before the present supreme Buddha. *Cf. Jā.* i. 43; *DhA.* i. 84, iii. 236; *D.* ii. 2 ff.

[3] See *Fur. Dial.* i. 93, n. 1 on meaning of " Suttas "; not explained in *Vin. Comy.* on above passage. Also on these names see E. J. Thomas, *Hist. of Buddhist Thought*, p. 277 ff., and J. Przyluski, *Le Concile de Rājagṛha*, p. 342 ff. At *DA.* i. 23 f., *VinA.* 28, *AA.* iii. 5 f., *Asl.* 26, these nine *aṅgas* of the Canon are listed and described.

[4] *Udāna.* On this name see *S.B.B.*, vol. xiii., p. v f.

[5] On derivation of *vedalla*, see J. Przyluski, *Le Concile de Rājagṛha*, p. 344; E. J. Thomas, *History of Buddhist Thought*, p. 278, n. 1.

[6] *VA.* 187, " after the disappearance of the *khandhas*, after the *parinibbāna*."

[7] *VA.* 187, *anubuddhā=sammukhasāvakā.* At *Thag.* 679=1246 =*S.* i. 193 *buddhânubuddho yo thero Koṇḍañño*, trans., " who next to our great Waked One was awake." *SA.* i. 282 says: " The Teacher was first enlightened in the four truths, afterwards the thera." Thus an interesting variation is apparent in the interpretation of *buddhânubuddha* as given by *SA.* and *VA.*

names, of various clans,[1] of various social strata,[2] who had gone forth from various families, caused this Brahma-life rapidly to disappear. It is as if, Sāriputta, various flowers, loose on a flat piece of wood,[3] not tied together by a thread, are scattered about, whirled about and destroyed by the wind. What is the cause? Inasmuch as they are not held together by a thread, even so, Sāriputta, at the disappearance of these enlightened ones, these lords, at the disappearance of the disciples enlightened under these enlightened ones, those last disciples of various names, of various clans, of various social strata, who had gone forth from various families, caused this Brahma-life rapidly to disappear. And these lords were untiring in exhorting the disciples, for they read their minds with their own.[4]

Formerly, Sāriputta, the lord Vessabhu, perfected, all enlightened one, in a certain awe-inspiring jungle-thicket exhorted and admonished a congregation of a thousand monks, reading their minds with his own, and saying: Apply the mind thus,[5] you should not apply the mind thus[6]; pay attention thus,[7] you should not pay attention thus[8]; forsake this[9]; having attained this,[10] abide in it. Then Sāriputta, when these thousand monks had been exhorted and admonished by Vessabhu, the lord, perfected, all enlightened one, their minds were freed from the cankers without grasping.[11] Moreover, Sāriputta, whoever not devoid of passion, is in a terror of the awe-inspiring jungle-thicket, and enters the jungle-

[1] *VA.* 187, such as "protected by Buddha, protected by dhamma."

[2] *VA.* 187, such as *khattiya, brāhmaṇa.*

[3] *phalaka,* a board, a plank. Perhaps a tray here, such as flower-vendors carry.

[4] *Cf. D.* i. 79; *M.* i. 445; *S.* ii. 233.

[5] *VA.* 188, *i.e.* to the three *vitakkā:* viz., renunciation, benevolence and non-injury.

[6] *Ibid.,* to their opposites: viz., sensual pleasures, malevolence and injury.

[7] *Ibid., i.e.* to impermanence, sorrow and non-self.

[8] *Ibid., i.e.* to their opposites.

[9] *Ibid., i.e.* what is wrong.

[10] *Ibid., i.e.* what is right.

[11] *Anupādāya.*

thicket, as a rule his hair stands on end. This, Sāriputta, is the cause, this is the reason why, when Vipassin was lord and when Sikhin was lord and when Vessabhu was lord, the Brahma-life did not last long." ||2||

"But what, lord, is the cause, what the reason why when Kakusandha was lord, and when Konāgamana was lord and when Kassapa was lord the Brahma-life lasted long?" [8]

"Sāriputta, the lord Kakusandha and the lord Konāgamana and the lord Kassapa were diligent in giving dhamma in detail to the disciples, and these had much of the Suttas in prose or in prose and in verse, the Expositions, the Songs, the Verses of Uplift, the Quotations, the Jātakas, the Miracles, the Miscellanies. The course of training for disciples was made known, the Pāṭimokkha was appointed. At the disappearance of these enlightened ones, these lords, at the disappearance of the disciples who were enlightened under these enlightened ones, those last disciples of various names, of various clans, of various social strata, who had gone forth from various families, established the Brahma-life for a very long time. It is as if, Sāriputta, various flowers, loose on a piece of wood, well tied together by a thread, are not scattered about or whirled about or destroyed by the wind. What is the reason for this? They are well tied together by the thread. Even so, Sāriputta, at the disappearance of these enlightened ones, these lords, at the disappearance of the disciples who were enlightened under these enlightened ones, those last disciples of various names, of various clans, of various social strata, who had gone forth from various families, established the Brahma-life for a very long time. This, Sāriputta, is the cause, this the reason why when Kakusandha was the lord, and when Konāgamana was the lord and when Kassapa was the lord, the Brahma-life lasted long." ||3||

Then the venerable Sāriputta, having risen from his seat, having arranged his outer robe over one shoulder,

and held out his joined palms in salutation to the lord, said to the lord:

"It is the right time, lord, it is the right time, well-farer,[1] at which the lord should make known the course of training for disciples and should appoint the Pāṭimokkha, in order that this Brahma-life may persist and last long."

"Wait, Sāriputta, wait, Sāriputta. The tathāgata will know the right time for that. The teacher does not make known, Sāriputta, the course of training for disciples, or appoint the Pāṭimokkha until some conditions causing the cankers appear here in the Order.[2] And as soon, Sāriputta, as some conditions causing the cankers appear here in the Order, then the teacher makes known the course of training for disciples, he appoints the Pāṭimokkha in order to ward off those conditions causing the cankers. Some conditions, Sāriputta, causing the cankers do not so much as appear here in the Order until the Order has attained long standing. And as soon, Sāriputta, as the Order has attained long standing, then some conditions causing the cankers appear here in the Order. Hence the teacher makes known the course of training for disciples [9], he appoints the Pāṭimokkha in order to ward off those conditions causing the cankers.[3] Some conditions, Sāriputta, causing the cankers do not so much as appear here in the Order until the Order has attained full development. And as soon, Sāriputta, as the Order has attained full development, then some conditions causing the cankers appear here in the Order. Hence the teacher makes known the course of training for disciples, he appoints the Pāṭimokkha in order to ward off those conditions causing the cankers.[4] Some conditions, Sāriputta, causing the cankers do not so much

[1] *Sugata.*

[2] *VA.* 191, things belonging to the here and now and to the next world, the bonds of murder, bad conscience and the reproaching of others, and a variety of ill and woe. For this passage, *cf. M.* i. 445.

[3] *VA.* 194 quotes *Vin. Mahāvagga*, i. 31.

[4] *VA.* 194 quotes *Pāc.* 5; *cf. MA.* iii. 156.

as appear here in the Order until the Order has attained the chief greatness of gain.[1] And as soon, Sāriputta, as the Order has attained the chief greatness of gain, then some conditions causing the cankers appear here in the Order. Hence the teacher makes known the course of training for disciples, he appoints the Pāṭimokkha in order to ward off those conditions causing the cankers.[2] Some conditions, Sāriputta, causing the cankers do not so much as appear here in the Order until the Order has attained great learning. And as soon, Sāriputta, as the Order has attained great learning, then some conditions causing the cankers appear here in the Order. Hence the teacher makes known the course of training for disciples, and appoints the Pāṭimokkha in order to ward off those conditions causing the cankers.[3] Sāriputta, the Order of monks is devoid of immorality,[4] devoid of danger, stainless, purified, based on the essential.[5] Sāriputta, the most backward[6] of these five hundred monks is one who has entered the stream, not liable to be reborn in any state of woe, assured, bound for enlightenment.[7] || 4 || **3** ||

---

[1] *lābhaggamahatta*. *VA*. 194 *lābhassa aggamahattaṃ yo lābhassa aggo uttamo mahantabhāvo taṃ patto hoti ti attho*. For list of "gains" see *A*. i. 38. At *M*. i. 445 we find *lābhaggaṃ*, trans. *Fur. Dial.* i. 317 as "wealth."

[2] *VA*. 195 quotes *Pāc*. 41; *cf*. *MA*. iii. 156.

[3] *VA*. 195 quotes *Pāc*. 68; *cf*. *MA*. iii. 157.

[4] *nirabbuda*. *Lokasmiṇ abbuda*, translated at *K.S*. i. 61 "a hell on earth," and *SA*. i. 100 says that "thieves are those who cause ruin in the world." At *VA*. 195 *nirabbudo=niccoro*, free from thieves. It explains that here thieves mean those who are immoral, not being true samaṇas; but pretending to be, they steal the requisites of others. Therefore *nirabbuda* (free from ruin) means free from thieves, free from immorality. *Nirabbuda* recurs below, *Vin*. iii. 18.

[5] Bu. says, *VA*. 195, that this consists of virtue, contemplation, wisdom, freedom, and knowledge and insight into freedom.

[6] *pacchimaka*. At *A*. ii. 80 and *D*. ii. 155 Gotama is made to use this sentence in addressing Ānanda. The *Comy*. on *A*. ii. 80 and at *DA*. ii. 593 say that by *pacchimaka*, Ānanda is meant. Our *Comy*. (*VA*. 195) naturally does not refer to him.

[7] A usual formula for stream-entrants.

Then the lord addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying: "Now, Ānanda, it is the custom for tathāgatas not to tour the country for almsfood without having (first) taken leave of those by whom they have been invited to spend the rains. Let us go, Ānanda, to the brahmin of Verañjā, and we will take leave."

"So be it, lord," answered the venerable Ānanda.

Then the lord, taking his bowl and robe and departing with the venerable Ānanda as his attendant,[1] came to the dwelling of the brahmin of Verañjā; and having come up he sat down on the appointed seat. Then the brahmin of Verañjā came up to the lord, and having come up he greeted the lord and sat down to one side. The lord said to the brahmin of Verañjā, as he was sitting to one side: [**10**]

"Brahmin, having spent the rains invited by you, we are taking leave of you: we wish to tour the country for alms."

"It is true, good Gotama, that you have spent the rains invited by me, but that the gifts (to mendicants) were not given. This was not because we did not want to give. But how was it possible? For the household life is busy and there is much to be done. May the revered Gotama consent to eat with me tomorrow together with the company of monks."

The lord consented by keeping silence. Then the lord, having taught, roused, gladdened and delighted the brahmin of Verañjā with dhamma-talk, rose from his seat and went away. Then the brahmin of Verañjā having had prepared abundant hard and soft foods[2] in his own home by the end of the night, made the time known to the lord:

"It is time, good Gotama, the meal is ready," he said.

Then the lord, rising up early and taking his bowl and robe, came up to the dwelling of the brahmin of Verañjā. Having come up together with the company of monks, he

---

[1] *Pacchāsamaṇa*, the junior monk who walks behind the senior on his rounds. Ānanda accompanies Gotama again at *Vin.* iv. 78.

[2] Defined at *Vin.* iv. 92.

sat down on the appointed seat. Then the brahmin of Verañjā, having served with his own hand abundant food, both hard and soft, to the company of monks with the enlightened one as their head, and having satisfied them, when the lord had eaten and had finished his meal, he clothed him with the threefold robes and he clothed each monk with a set of garments.[1] Then the lord, having instructed, roused, gladdened and delighted the brahmin of Verañjā with talk on dhamma, rose from his seat and departed.

Then the lord, having remained at Verañjā for as long as he found suitable, returning by Soreyya,[2] Saṅkassa[3] and Kaṇṇakujja[4] came to Payāgapatiṭṭhāna,[5] and having come to Payāgapatiṭṭhāna and crossing the river Ganges, he went down to Benares. And the lord having remained at Benares for as long as he found suitable, set out for Vesālī for alms. In due course, wandering for alms, he arrived at Vesālī.[6] The lord stayed there at Vesālī in the Gabled Hall in the Great Wood. || **4** ||

Told is the Recital on Verañjā

Now at that time not far from Vesālī was a village called Kalandaka. The son of a Kalandaka, the great merchant[7] there, was named Sudinna, the Kalandaka.

---

[1] *dussayuga*, *cf. Vin.* i. 278 and *Vin. Texts* ii. 190, n.; *M.* i. 215 =*S.* v. 71.

[2] A town near Takkasilā; mentioned also in connection with these other two towns at *Vin.* ii. 299.

[3] A town, said by Fausböll to be the *locus* of *Dhp.* 181. At its gate Sāriputta interpreted a problem, on which Jātaka 134 is based. See *Jā.* i. 473.

[4] A town.

[5] The modern Allahabad.

[6] Capital of the Vajji country. See B. C. Law, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, p. 12 f.

[7] *VA.* 202 says that as other people there were called Kalanda(ka), Sudinna was also called " son of the great merchant " (*seṭṭhiputta*) —to distinguish him.

Now Sudinna the Kalandaka[1] went to Vesālī, together with many friends, on some [11] business. At that time the lord was seated, surrounded by a great company of people, and teaching dhamma. When Sudinna, the Kalandaka, saw the lord seated, surrounded by a great company of people, and teaching dhamma, he thought[2]: "What now if I were to listen to dhamma?"[3] Then Sudinna, the Kalandaka, came up to this company, and having come up, he sat down to one side. As he was sitting to one side, Sudinna, the Kalandaka, thought: "So far as I understand dhamma taught by the lord, it is no easy matter for one who lives in a house to lead the Brahma-life, complete and undefiled and polished like a conch-shell. What now if I were to cut off my hair and beard and don the yellow robes and go forth from home into homelessness?"

When the crowd had been taught, roused, gladdened and delighted by the lord with talk on dhamma, and had risen from their seats, greeting the lord and walking round him, keeping their right side towards him, they departed. And not long after the crowd had departed Sudinna, the Kalandaka, came up to the lord and having come up, he greeted the lord and sat down to one side. As he was sitting to one side, Sudinna, the Kalandaka, spoke thus to the lord:

"Lord, so far as I understand dhamma taught by the lord, it is not an easy matter for one who lives in a house to lead the Brahma-life, complete and undefiled and polished like a conch-shell. I desire, lord, having cut off my hair and beard and having donned the yellow robes, to go forth from home into homelessness. May the lord let me go forth."

---

[1] Referred to at *Vin.* ii. 286 as "the first pārājika, promulgated at Vesālī on account of Sudinna with regard to sexual intercourse." Referred to at *Miln.* 170.

[2] *VA.* 202, "because having in former births been very meritorious, he was incited, a clansman's son, bound to become" (*bhabbakulaputta*).

[3] This same story is told in practically the same words about Raṭṭhapāla at *M.* ii. 55 ff.

"But, Sudinna, have you your parents' consent to go forth?"

"No, lord, I have not my parents' consent to go forth."

"Sudinna, tathāgatas do not ordain a child without the parents' consent."

"I will do whatever is necessary, so that my parents will consent to my going forth from home into homelessness, lord." || 1 ||

Then Sudinna, the Kalandaka, having finished his business in Vesālī, went up to his parents in the village of Kalandaka, and having come up to his parents, he spoke thus:

"Mother and father, in so far as I understand dhamma taught by the lord, it is no easy matter for one who lives in a house to lead the Brahma-life, complete and undefiled and polished like a conch-shell. Having cut off my hair and beard and donned the yellow robes, I wish to go forth from home [12] into homelessness. Give me your consent to go forth from home into homelessness."

When Sudinna, the Kalandaka, had spoken thus, his parents said to him:

"But you, dear Sudinna, are our only child, dear and beloved, you live in comfort and are well cared for. Dear Sudinna, you do not know anything of discomfort. Your death would make us desolate with no pleasure left. How can we, while you are still living, consent that you should go forth from home into homelessness?"

A second time Sudinna, the Kalandaka, spoke thus to his parents: "Mother and father . . ." ". . . from home into homelessness?" A third time Sudinna, the Kalandaka, spoke thus to his parents: "Mother and father . . ." ". . . from home into homelessness?"

Then Sudinna, the Kalandaka, said: "My parents do not consent to my going forth from home into homelessness." So he lay down on the bare ground and said: "I will die here, or go forth." Then Sudinna, the Kalandaka, did not eat one meal, nor did he eat two

meals, nor did he eat three meals, nor did he eat four meals, nor did he eat five meals, nor did he eat six meals, nor did he eat seven meals.[1] And then the parents of Sudinna, the Kalandaka, spoke thus to him:

"Dear Sudinna, you are our only child, dear and beloved, you live in comfort and are well cared for. Dear Sudinna, you know nothing of discomfort. Your death would make us desolate with no pleasure left. How can we, while you are still living, consent that you should go forth from home into homelessness? Get up, dear Sudinna, eat and drink and amuse yourself; eating, drinking, amusing yourself, delighting in sensual pleasures and doing meritorious deeds,[2] enjoy yourself.[3] We do not consent to your going forth from home into homelessness."

When they had spoken thus, Sudinna, the Kalandaka, was silent. A second time and a third time the parents of Sudinna, the Kalandaka, said: ". . . We do not consent to your going forth from home into homelessness." A third time was Sudinna, the Kalandaka, silent. || 2 ||

Then the friends of Sudinna, the Kalandaka, came up to him, and having come up they spoke to him thus: "You, good Sudinna, are your [13] parents' only child, dear and beloved; you live in comfort and are well cared for. You do not know anything, good Sudinna, of discomfort. Your death would make your parents desolate with no pleasures left. How can they, while you are still living, consent that you should go forth from home into homelessness? Get up, good Sudinna. Eat and drink and amuse yourself; eating, drinking and amusing yourself, take delight in sensual pleasures and doing meritorious deeds, enjoy yourself. Your parents

[1] This passage omitted at *M.* ii. 57, see *loc. cit.*, n. 7.

[2] *VA.* 205, "giving gifts, cleansing the way to a good bourn, doing good actions."

[3] *Abhiramassu*, or "indulge in love"; but from the context I think not here. *Cf.* below, p. 114.

cannot consent to your going forth from home into homelessness."

When they had spoken thus, Sudinna, the Kalandaka, was silent. A second and a third time the friends of Sudinna, the Kalandaka, spoke thus to him: "You, good Sudinna, are . . ." and a third time Sudinna, the son of Kalandaka, was silent. || 3 ||

Then the friends of Sudinna, the Kalandaka, went up to his parents, and having come up to them, they said:

"Mother and father, this Sudinna, lying on the bare ground, says that he will die there or go forth. If you do not consent to Sudinna's going forth from home into homelessness he will die there. But if you consent to his going forth from home into homelessness, after he has gone forth you may see him again. If he does not enjoy the going forth from home into homelessness, what alternative[1] will he have than to come back here? Consent to Sudinna's going forth from home into homelessness."

"We consent, my dears, to Sudinna's going forth from home into homelessness," they said.

Then the friends of Sudinna, the Kalandaka, went up to him, and having gone up, they said to him: "Get up, good Sudinna, your parents consent to your going forth from home into homelessness."

Then Sudinna, the Kalandaka, said: "They say that my parents consent to my going forth from home into homelessness." And he rose, joyful, delighted, elated, smoothing his limbs with his hands. Then Sudinna, the Kalandaka, after a few days when he had regained his strength, went up to the lord, and having come up he greeted the lord and sat down to one side. As he was sitting to one side, Sudinna, the Kalandaka, spoke thus to the lord:

"I am permitted by my parents, lord, to go forth from home into homelessness. May the lord allow me to go forth." [**14**]

[1] *gati*, lit. going or bourn.

Then Sudinna, the Kalandaka, received the pabbajjā ordination in the presence of the lord, and he received the upasampadā ordination. And not long afterwards the venerable Sudinna went about with these qualities[1] to the fore: he was a dweller in the jungle, a beggar for alms, one who wore rags taken from the dust-heap, one who went on continuous alms-begging from house to house; and he dwelt depending on a certain village of the Vajjians. || 4 ||

At that time the Vajjians[2] were short of almsfood,[3] which was difficult to obtain; they were suffering from a famine, and food-tickets were issued. Nor was it easy to keep oneself going by gleaning or by favour. Now the venerable Sudinna thought to himself: "At present the Vajjians are short of almsfood, which is difficult to obtain; they are suffering from a famine, and food-tickets are being issued. It is not easy to keep oneself going by gleaning or by favour. But in Vesālī my relations are rich, with great resources and possessions, having immense (supplies of) gold and silver,[4] immense means and immense resources in corn.[5] What now if I should dwell supported by my family? Relations will give gifts for my support, they will do meritorious actions; and the monks will profit and I will not go short of almsfood."

Then the venerable Sudinna, packing up his bedding and taking his bowl and robe, set out for Vesālī, where he arrived in due course. The venerable Sudinna stayed there at Vesālī in the Gabled Hall in the Great Wood. The relations of the venerable Sudinna said to themselves: "They say that Sudinna, the Kalandaka,

---

[1] *VA*. 206, *dhutaguṇe=kilesaniddhunanake-guṇe.*

[2] Tribes belonging to one of the sixteen stock *mahājanapadas* (*A*. i. 213; iv. 252, 256, 260). See E. J. Thomas, *The Life of Buddha*, p. 13, and, on the Vajjis or Vajjians, T. W. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 25.

[3] *Cf.* above Pār. I. **2**, 1, and below, Pār. IV. **1**, 1.

[4] *jātarūpa-rajata*. See below, p. 28, n. 1.

[5] For this stock phrase *cf. A*. ii. 86; *S*. i. 17. On prosperity of Vesālī, *cf. Vin*. i. 268.

has arrived at Vesālī." And they brought him as a gift of food sixty offerings of barley.[1] Then the venerable Sudinna, having given these sixty offerings of barley to the monks, rising early and taking his bowl and robe, entered the village of Kalandaka for alms. As he was going about Kalandaka village on a continuous alms-tour, he came up to his own father's house. || 5 ||

At that time the female slave of the venerable Sudinna's relations wanted to throw away the previous evening's barley-gruel. But the venerable Sudinna spoke thus to this female slave:

"If that, sister, is to be thrown away, put it here in my bowl."

Then as the slave-girl of the venerable Sudinna's relations was heaping the previous evening's barley-gruel into his bowl, she recognised his hands and feet and voice.[2] Then the female slave of the venerable Sudinna's relations went up to his mother, and having come up she said to her:

"If it please you,[3] madam, you should know that the young master[4] Sudinna is back?"

"Now then, if you speak the truth, I will make you a freed woman."

At that time the venerable Sudinna was eating the previous evening's barley-gruel in the room provided for the purpose.[5] Then the [15] venerable Sudinna's father coming from work, saw the venerable Sudinna

[1] *VA.* 207 explains that each offering would feed ten monks, therefore sixty would feed six hundred.

[2] *VA.* 208 explains that Sudinna had been a monk for eight years, so although the slave did not know him at once, she recognized the character of his hands, feet and voice.

[3] *yagghe.*

[4] *ayyaputta.*

[5] *aññataran kuḍḍamūlaŋ nissāya. P.T.S. Dict.* calls *kuḍḍamūla*, "a sort of root." But *VA.* 209 says it means "that in this district there are rooms in the houses of the large householders where there are seats prepared, and where those going for alms sit down and eat the gruel offered to them." *Cf. M.* i. 62, where *kuḍḍaŋ* with *v.l. kuḍḍamūlaŋ. MA.* iii. 297=*VA.* 210. Lord Chalmers translates "under the hedge." May mean "leaning against a wall."

eating the previous evening's barley-gruel in the room provided for the purpose; and seeing the venerable Sudinna he came up to him, and having come up he said to him:

"Can it be, dear Sudinna, that you are eating last evening's barley-gruel. Surely, dear Sudinna, you should go into your own home?"

"We went, householder, to your house; hence last evening's barley-gruel."

Then the father of the venerable Sudinna, taking him by the arm, said to him: "Come, dear Sudinna, we will go to the house."

Then the venerable Sudinna came up to the dwelling of his own father, and having come up he sat down on the appointed seat. And the father of the venerable Sudinna said to him: "Eat, dear Sudinna."

"Not so, householder; today's meal is over for me."

"Consent, dear Sudinna, to eat tomorrow."

The venerable Sudinna consented by keeping silent. Then the venerable Sudinna, rising from his seat, departed. Then the mother of the venerable Sudinna, having had the ground smeared with fresh cow-dung, had two heaps made, one of gold coins[1] and the other

---

[1] *ekaṃ hiraññassa ekaṃ suvaṇṇassa.* At *M.* ii. 63 the reading is *hiraññasuvaṇṇassa* (*puñjaṃ*), translated at *Fur. Dial.* ii. 32, "of gold and bullion," and then again "treasure." Rhys Davids, *Ancient Coins*, etc., p. 5, gives other and earlier translations for both these passages. There is no doubt that *two* heaps are meant, *cf. MA.* iii. 299, and that therefore the two words *hirañña* and *suvaṇṇa* are intended to represent a difference in the materials of which the heaps were composed. *Cf.* below, *Vin.* iii. 48, 216, *hiraññaṃ vā suvaṇṇaṃ vā.* I think that there is little doubt that *suvaṇṇa* is the worked or refined gold, but it does not appear to follow in the least that *hirañña* is therefore the unworked, unrefined gold. For at *A.* i. 253 *jātarūpa* is clearly the unworked (sterling) gold; the process of working this is described, and when finished some gold ornament is the result. (At *Vin.* iii. 238 *jātarūpa* is called *satthuvaṇṇa*, the colour of the Teacher.) I therefore cannot subscribe to the translation of *hiraññasuvaṇṇa* at *Fur. Dial.* ii. 94 (=*M.* ii. 166) as "wrought and unwrought gold." *Jātarūpa* is gold in its unwrought state, therefore, *hirañña* will almost certainly have some other meaning, with a greater or lesser shade of difference.

of gold. The heaps were so large that from this side a man standing could not see a man standing at the other side, and from the other side a man standing could not see a man standing at this side. Hiding these heaps with screens, and preparing a seat between them surrounded by a curtain, she addressed the venerable Sudinna's former wife, saying:

"Daughter-in-law, adorn yourself with those orna-

At p. 79 *Comy.* leads one to suppose that *hirañña* is an ornament; *cf.* Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary* under *hiraṇya*, where one of the meanings given is "a golden ornament (*Ved.*)." But I think that *hirañña* most probably means "gold coins." N.B.—use of the plural at *Vin.* iii. 219. According to Boehtlingk (*Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*) it meant "Gold, später auch Geld," and this is the interpretation put upon it in some commentarial passages, and I think also at *S.* i. 89 where *hirañña* is balanced by *rūpiya*, silver (=*rajata*, see *Vin.* iii. 238, 240, except that at 240 *rūpiya* is also called *satthuvaṇṇa*, which at 238 is reserved for *jātarūpa*). *VA.* 210 on the above passage says that "here *hirañña* should be called *kahāpaṇa.*" And at *SnA.* 323, on *Sn.* 307, and *SnA.* 513 on *Sn.* 769 *hirañña* is explained as *kahāpaṇasaṃkhāta*, while at *SnA.* 315 on *Sn.* 285 it is said that *na hirañña* means that "there was not even quarter of a māsaka," (on *māsaka*, see below, p. 72). In none of these *Sn.* passages is *hirañña* combined with *suvaṇṇa*, which is interesting and curious. Although the Commentator shows a tendency to call *hirañña* kahāpaṇa, this does not get us much further. For we do not exactly know what a kahāpaṇa was at any given time. At *Vin.* iii. 238, 240 it appears in the definitions of *rajata* and *rūpiya*, but at the time of the Vinaya its value may have been different from that which it had at Bu.'s time. All we can say is that the kahāpaṇa was the medium of exchange in Pali literature, and because the Commentators sometimes explain *hirañña* by kahāpaṇa, then the nearest we can get to a translation at present is "gold coins." This seems a more likely translation than "gold leaf" (which so far as I know has never been suggested). *Hirañña* is undoubtedly connected with *hari*, meaning "yellow, yellowish, green, greenish," and I find that in the *Ency. Brit.* it is said of gold that "while in very thin leaves it transmits a greenish light." Before the days when it was fashionable to plaster stupas and images of the Buddha with gold-leaf, it is not, however, very likely that this substance would have been used in any large quantities. Rich people would have been more apt to have "heaps of gold coins." Although more Pali literature is available to us than was to Rhys Davids, we must still say with him (*Ancient Coins*, etc., p. 5) that "to decide these points we must have more texts before us."

ments, adorned with which you were dear to my son, Sudinna, and beloved by him."

"Very good, noble lady," the former wife of the venerable Sudinna answered his mother. || 6 ||

Then the venerable Sudinna, rising early and taking his bowl and robe, came up to the dwelling of his own father, and having come up he sat down on the appointed seat. Then the father of the venerable Sudinna came up to him, and having come up, revealing the heaps, he spoke thus to the venerable Sudinna:

"This, dear Sudinna, is your mother's fortune, the wife's dowry because she is a woman. This is your father's and the other is your paternal grandfather's.[1] It is possible, dear Sudinna, while leading the low life of a layman, both to enjoy riches and to do meritorious actions. Come, dear Sudinna, while leading the low life of a layman, enjoy riches and do meritorious actions." **[16]**

"I am not able to do so, father, I cannot. Delighted,[2] I lead the Brahma-life."

A second and a third time the father of the venerable Sudinna spoke thus to him: "This, dear Sudinna, is your mother's portion, the wife's dowry because she is a woman. That is your father's and the other is your paternal grandfather's. It is possible, dear Sudinna, while leading the low life of a layman, both to enjoy riches and to do meritorious actions. Come, dear Sudinna, enjoy riches while leading the low life of a layman, and do meritorious actions."

"If you would not take it in bad part, householder, we could tell you what (to do)."

"Speak, dear Sudinna," he said.

"Well then, you, householder, having had very large bags of hemp-cloth made, having had them filled with the coins and the gold, and having had them brought

[1] It is curious that here there seem to be *three* heaps, whereas just above it is said that *two* were made.

[2] *abhirato*, to be translated in this context as above. But see below, p. 114.

down on wagons—sink them in the middle stream of the Ganges. And why? Because, householder, on account of them you will become either frightened or terrified,[1] or your hair will stand on end, or there will be no protection for you."

When he had thus spoken the father of the venerable Sudinna was not pleased, and said: "Why does the son, Sudinna, speak thus?" Then the venerable Sudinna's father addressed the venerable Sudinna's former wife:

"Well now, daughter-in-law, as you were dear and beloved, so perhaps now the son Sudinna will do your bidding."

Then the former wife of the venerable Sudinna, taking hold of his feet, spoke thus to the venerable Sudinna:

"What are these (deva[2]-)nymphs like, son of my lord, for whose sake you lead the Brahma-life?"

"I do not lead the Brahma-life, sister, for the sake of (deva[2]-)nymphs."

Then the former wife of the venerable Sudinna said:

"From this day on my lord's son greets me by saying 'sister,'" and she fell down at that very spot in a swoon. || 7 ||

Then the venerable Sudinna spoke thus to his father:

"If, householder, there is food to be given, give it, but do not annoy me."

"Eat, dear Sudinna," he said.

Then the mother and the father of the venerable Sudinna waited on him and satisfied him with abundant food, both hard and soft. Then when the venerable Sudinna had eaten and had finished his meal his mother said to him:

"This family, dear Sudinna, is rich, of great resources and possessions, having immense supplies of gold and silver, immense means, and immense resources in corn. It is possible, dear Sudinna, while leading the low life of a layman, both to enjoy riches and to do meritorious

---

[1] *Chambhitatta*, see below, p. 119, n. 3.
[2] So *VA*. 212.

actions. Come, dear Sudinna, enjoy riches while leading the low life of a layman and do meritorious actions."

"Mother, I am not able to do so, [17] I cannot. Delighted,[1] I lead the good life."

A second time and a third time the mother of the venerable Sudinna spoke to him thus:

"This family, dear Sudinna, is rich, of great resources and possessions, having immense (supplies of) gold and silver, immense means, and immense resources in corn. For this reason, dear Sudinna, beget offspring; do not let the Licchavis[2] take over our heirless property."

"It is possible for me to do this,[3] mother," he said.

"Where, dear Sudinna, are you staying at present?" she said.

"In the Great Wood, mother," he said. Then the venerable Sudinna, rising up from his seat, departed. || 8 ||

Then the mother of the venerable Sudinna addressed his former wife, saying:

"Daughter-in-law, as soon as you menstruate, the flow coming, you should tell me."

"Very well, noble lady," the former wife of the venerable Sudinna answered his mother. Not long afterwards the former wife of the venerable Sudinna menstruated and the flow began. And the former wife of the venerable Sudinna said to his mother: "Noble lady, I am menstruating and the flow has begun."

"Daughter-in-law, adorn yourself with those ornaments, adorned with which you were dear to my son Sudinna and beloved by him," she said.

"Very well, noble lady," the former wife of the venerable Sudinna answered his mother.

---

[1] *abhirato*, here I think meaning simply as translated above. But see below, p. 114.

[2] Their capital was at Vesālī.

[3] *VA*. 212 says that he said this thinking that if he had issue his relations would no longer bother him about looking after the property, and so he would be able to follow the dhamma of recluses at ease.

Then the mother of the venerable Sudinna together with his former wife went up to the venerable Sudinna in the Great Wood, and having come up she spoke thus to him:

"This family, dear Sudinna, is rich, of great resources and possessions, having immense (supplies of) gold and silver, immense means, and immense resources in corn. For this reason, dear Sudinna, beget offspring; do not let the Licchavis take over our heirless property."

"It is possible for me to do this, mother," he said, and taking his former wife by the arm and plunging into the Great Wood, and seeing no danger, since the course of training had not been made known, three times he induced his former wife to indulge in sexual intercourse with him. As a result she conceived. The earth-devas made this sound heard:

"Good sirs, the company of monks is without immorality,[1] it is not beset by danger, but immorality is evoked, danger is evoked by Sudinna, the Kalandaka."

The retinue of the Four Firmament devas, having heard the sound of the earth-devas, made this sound heard . . . the Thirty devas . . . the Yāma devas . . . the Happy devas . . . the devas who delight in creation . . . [18] the devas who delight in the creation of others . . . the devas belonging to the retinue of Brahmā made this sound heard:

"Good sirs, the company of monks is without immorality, it is not beset by danger, but immorality is evoked, danger is evoked by Sudinna, the Kalandaka." Thus in this very moment, this very second, the sound went forth as far as the Brahmā-world.[2] Then the womb of the venerable Sudinna's former wife came to maturity, and she gave birth to a son. Now the friends of the venerable Sudinna called this boy Bījaka; they called the former wife of the venerable Sudinna, Bījaka's mother; they called the venerable

[1] *nirabbuda, cf.* above, p. 19, n. 4.

[2] *VA.* 215, *brahmalokā=akaniṭṭhabrahmalokā, i.e.* the worlds of the Elder Brahmā-devas.

Sudinna, Bījaka's father. At (some) later time, both[1] having gone forth from home into homelessness, they realised arahanship. || 9 ||

Then the venerable Sudinna was remorseful and conscience-stricken, and said:

"It surely is not a gain to me, it surely is not a gain to me, I have surely ill-gained, I have surely not well-gained, that having gone forth under this dhamma and discipline which are well preached, I was not able for all my life to lead the Brahma-life, complete and purified." And because of his remorse and bad conscience, he became haggard, wretched, of a bad colour, yellowish, the veins showing all over his body, melancholy, of sluggish mind, miserable, depressed, repentant, weighed down with grief.[2] Then the monks who were the friends of the venerable Sudinna said to him:

"Formerly you, reverend Sudinna, were handsome, your features were rounded, your face was a good colour, your skin clear. But now at present you are haggard, wretched, a bad colour, yellowish, your veins showing all over your body, melancholy, of sluggish mind, miserable, depressed, repentant, weighed down with grief. Can it be that you, reverend Sudinna, lead the Brahma-life dissatisfied?"[3]

"I do not, your reverences, lead the Brahma-life dissatisfied. I have done an evil deed. I have indulged in sexual intercourse with my former wife. That is why, your reverences, I am remorseful . . . to lead the Brahma-life, complete and purified."

"Reverend Sudinna, you ought to feel remorse,[4] reverend Sudinna, you ought to have a bad conscience, because you, having gone forth under dhamma and the discipline which are well preached, cannot during your life-time lead the Brahma-life, complete and purified.

---

[1] *Ibid.*—*i.e.*, Bījaka and his mother. [2] Stock.

[3] *anabhirato*, *VA.* 217, "fretting, longing to be a householder . . . but I find no delight (*anabhirato*) in making become the conditions of higher righteousness." See below, p. 114, notes.

[4] = *Vin.* ii. 250.

Is not, your reverence, dhamma taught by the lord in various ways for the sake of passionlessness, not for the sake of passion; is not dhamma taught for the sake of being without fetters, not for the sake of being bound; is not dhamma taught for the sake of being without grasping, not for the sake of grasping? How can you, your reverence, while this dhamma is taught by the lord for the sake of passionlessness, strive after passion; how can you while this dhamma is taught by the lord for the sake of being without fetters, [19] strive after being bound; how can you while this dhamma is taught by the lord for the sake of being without grasping, strive after grasping? Is not, your reverence, dhamma taught in many ways by the lord for the waning of passion, is not dhamma taught for the subduing of conceit, for the restraint of desire, for the abolition of clinging, for the annihilation of the round of becomings,[1] for the destruction of craving, for passionlessness, for stopping, for waning?[2] Has not, your reverence, the destruction of the pleasures of the senses been declared in many ways by the lord, full understanding of ideas of the pleasures of the senses been declared, restraint in clinging to the pleasures of the senses been declared, the elimination of thoughts of pleasures of the senses been declared, the allaying of the fever of the pleasures of the senses been declared? It is not, your reverence, for the benefit of non-believers, nor for the increase in the number of believers, but it is, your reverence, to the detriment of both non-believers and believers, and it causes wavering in some." || 10 ||

Then these monks, having rebuked the venerable Sudinna in various ways, told this matter to the lord. And the lord for this reason, in this connection, having had the company of monks convened, questioned the venerable Sudinna, saying:

[1] *VA.* 218, *tebhūmakavaṭṭaṃ ucchijjati* (*i.e.* the *kāma*, *rūpa* and *arūpa* becomings).

[2] *Cf. A.* ii. 34, and various passages in *S.* v.

"Is it true, as is said, Sudinna, that you indulged in sexual intercourse with your former wife?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"It is not fit, foolish man, it is not becoming, it is not proper, it is unworthy of a recluse, it is not lawful, it ought not to be done. How is that you, foolish man, having gone forth under this dhamma and discipline which are well taught, are not able for your lifetime to lead the Brahma-life which is complete and wholly purified? How can you strive, foolish man, while dhamma is taught by me in various ways for the sake of passionlessness . . . foolish man, by me for the sake of passionlessness. Foolish man, is not dhamma taught by me in various ways for the waning of passion . . . the destruction of pleasures of the senses . . . the allaying of the fever of the pleasures of the senses been declared? It were better for you, foolish man, that your male organ should enter the mouth of a terrible and poisonous snake, than that it should enter a woman. It were better for you, foolish man, that your male organ should enter the mouth of a black snake, than that it should enter a woman. It were better for you, foolish man, that your male organ should enter a charcoal pit, burning, ablaze, afire, than that it should enter a woman. What is the cause for this? For *that* reason, foolish man, you would go to death, or to suffering like unto death, but not on that account would you pass at the breaking up of the body after death to the waste, the bad bourn, the abyss, hell. But for *this* reason, foolish man, at the breaking up of the body after death, you would pass to the waste, [**20**] the bad bourn, the abyss, hell.[1] Thus for this very deed, foolish man, you will enter upon what is not verily dhamma,[2] upon village

[1] *Cf.* below, p. 155.

[2] *asaddhamma*. *VA*. 221, "You would follow untrue dhamma of inferior people." On prefix *sa-* see Mrs. Rhys Davids, introduction to *G.S.* I. ix. f.

dhamma, upon a low dhamma,[1] upon wickedness, upon final ablution,[2] upon secrecy, upon having obtained in couples. Foolish man, you are the first-doer of many wrong things. It is not, foolish man, for the benefit of un-believers, nor for the increase in the number of believers, but, foolish man, it is to the detriment of both unbelievers and believers, and it causes wavering in some."

Then the lord, having rebuked the venerable Sudinna in various ways, and having spoken in dispraise of his difficulty in supporting and maintaining himself, of his arrogance, of his lack of contentment, of his clinging (to the obstructions[3]) and of his indolence; and having spoken in various ways of the ease of supporting and maintaining oneself, of desiring little, of contentment, of expunging (evil),[4] of punctiliousness, of what is gracious, of decreasing (the obstructions[5]) and of the putting forth of energy,[6] and having given suitable and befitting talk on dhamma to the monks, he addressed the monks, saying:

"On account of this,[7] monks, I will make known the course of training for monks, founded on ten reasons: for the excellence of the Order, for the comfort of the Order, for the restraint of evil-minded men, for the ease

---

[1] *VA.* 221, "outcastes (*vasala*) rain down evil dhamma; the dhamma of the outcaste, low men is outcaste, or it is a dhamma pouring out the kilesas." *Vasala* at *Sn.* 116 ff. translated by Lord Chalmers, Suttanipāta, *H.O.S.* 37, as "wastrel."

[2] *Odakantika—i.e.*, following the sexual act. *VA.* 221 explains: *udakakiccaṃ antikaṃ avasānaṃ assâ ti*, the water-libation (the cleansing, the washing) is at an end, finished for him. The word *udakakicca* occurs at *D.* ii. 15, but *DA.* is silent.

[3] *Saṁganika=kilesasaṁganika*, *VA.* 222.

[4] *Sallekhana=niddhunana*, *VA.* 222.

[5] *Apacaya=sabbakilesâpacayabhūtā*, *VA.* 222.

[6] =*Vin.* i. 45=ii. 2=iii. 171=iv. 213, where this standing dhamma-talk is given. These are doubtless the subjects to be filled in where the text in so many places baldly states that Gotama "gave dhamma-talk." All my renderings differ from those given at *Vin. Texts* i. 153, ii. 331; iii. 252. *Cf. M.* i. 13. *Comy.* on *Vin.* iii. 171 is silent.

[7] *I.e.*, Sudinna's offence, *VA.* 223.

of well-behaved monks, for the restraint of the cankers belonging to the here and now, for the combating of the cankers belonging to other worlds, for the benefit of non-believers, for the increase in the number of believers, for establishing dhamma indeed,[1] for following the rules of restraint.[2] Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should indulge in sexual intercourse is one who is defeated,[3] he is no longer in communion."

And thus this course of training for the monks was set forth by the lord. || 11 || **5** ||

Told is the Sudinna Recital

Now at that time a certain monk in the Great Wood at Vesālī, on account of his lust *kept a female monkey. Then this monk, rising early and taking his bowl and robe, entered Vesālī for alms. Now at that time a large concourse of monks, who were engaged in touring for lodgings, came up to this monk's vihāra. The female monkey, seeing these monks coming from afar, went up to them and *postured before them. [21] Then these

[1] *VA.* 225 says that *saddhamma* is threefold: (1) the Tipiṭaka, all the utterances of the Buddha (*cf. KhuA.* 191 ff.); (2) the thirteen scrupulous ways of life, the fourteen duties, virtue, contemplation, insight; (3) the four ariyan Ways and the four fruits of samaṇaship and nibbāna.

[2] *VA.* 226 says that Vinaya or discipline is fourfold: discipline by restraint, by rejection, by calm, by making known.

[3] On derivation of *pārājika*, see *Vin. Texts* i. 3, n. 2. Editor takes it as "involving or suffering defeat," either specifically as defeat in the struggle with Māra; or more probably defeat in the struggle against evil generally, defeat in the effort to accomplish the supreme goal of arahanship. *VA.* 259 gives *pārājiko ti parājito, parājayam āpanno*, defeated, fallen on defeat. "In this meaning *pārājika* exists for those people for whom there is an offence (*āpatti*) against the training. Whoever transgresses against the course of training, it defeats him (*parājeti*), therefore it is called a defeat. Whoever commits an offence, that defeats him, therefore that is called a defeat. The man, inasmuch as defeated, fallen on defeat, is thereby called a defeated one." We thus get a neuter, feminine and masculine reference for *pārājika*. Childers says, "meriting expulsion."

monks thought: "Undoubtedly this monk *has committed fornication," and they hid themselves to one side. Then this monk, when he had gone about Vesālī for alms, returned with his almsfood, and eating half gave the other half to the female monkey. *And there was some misbehaviour. Then those monks said to that monk:

"Surely the course of training has been made known by the lord, your reverence? Why do you *commit fornication, your reverence?"

"It is true, your reverences, that the course of training was made known by the lord, but it refers to the human woman and not to the female animal."

"But surely, your reverence, it refers just as much to that. It is not fit, your reverence, it is not suitable, it is not becoming, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not lawful, it ought not to be done. How it is that you, your reverence, having gone forth under this dhamma and discipline which are well taught, are not able to lead for your life-time the Brahma-life, complete and wholly purified? Has not, your reverence, dhamma been taught in various ways by the lord for the sake of passionlessness and not for the sake of passion[1] . . . and the allaying of the fever of the pleasures of the senses been declared? It is not, your reverence, for the benefit of non-believers . . . and it causes wavering in some."

Then these monks, having rebuked this monk in various ways, told this matter to the lord. And the lord for this reason and in this connection, having the company of monks convened, questioned this monk thus:

"Is it true, as is said, monk, that you *committed fornication?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

Then the lord rebuked him, saying: (=**5**. 11 above. *Instead of* village dhamma, *read* the state of monkeys) ". . . having obtained in couples. It is not, foolish

---

[1] *Cf.* above, Pār. I. **5**. 10.

man, for the benefit of non-believers. . . . Monks, thus this course of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should indulge in sexual intercourse even with an animal[1] is one who is defeated, he is not in communion."

And thus this course of training for monks was made known by the lord. || 6 ||

Story of the Female Monkey [22]

Now at that time, a great company of monks, dwellers at Vesālī and sons of the Vajjins, ate as much as they liked, drank as much as they liked and bathed as much as they liked. Having eaten, drunk and bathed as much as they liked, not having paid attention to the training, but not having disavowed[2] it, they indulged in sexual intercourse not having declared their weakness.[3] These, in the course of time being affected by misfortune to their relatives, being affected by misfortune to their wealth, being affected by the misfortune of disease, approaching the venerable Ānanda, spoke thus to him:

"Honoured Ānanda, we are not abusers of the enlightened one, we are not abusers of dhamma, we are not abusers of the Order. Honoured Ānanda, we are

[1] *Cf. Vin.* i. 96.

[2] *sikkhaṃ apaccakkhāya*, not having denied the teaching, not having said: "I renounce (formally) my submission to the discipline," *i.e.* "I am no longer a monk." *Cf. Vin. Texts* i. 275, n. 2, where editor thinks this is a formal renunciation of the Order as opposed to the Vinaya's term *vibbhamati*, "he returns to the house." *Cf. A.* iv. 372, where among the nine Impossibles (*abhabba*) is that the monk who is an arahan should disavow the buddha, dhamma or Order. At *S.* ii. 231 a monk, assailed by passion, disavows the training and *hīnâyāvattati*, the Sutta word for returning to the low life of the layman, and *cf. S.* ii. 271.

Paccakkhāti is *paṭi+akkhāti=ā+khyā*, and not *paṭi+akkh*. The root *akkh* is purely theoretical and would certainly not explain the *ā* of *paccakkhāti*, *paccakkhāya*.

[3] This refers, as noted in *Vin. Texts* i. 4, n. 1, to the permission (on the ground that it was better to leave the Order than to burn, see above, Pār. I. 5, 11), for a monk to acknowledge himself unfit for the discipline and to throw off the robes.

self-abusers, not abusers of others. Indeed we are unlucky, we are of little merit, for we, having gone forth under this dhamma and discipline which are well taught, are not able for our life-time to lead the Brahma-life, complete and wholly purified. Even now, honoured Ānanda, if we might receive the pabbajjā ordination in the presence of the lord, if we might receive the upasampadā ordination, then contemplating, we would dwell continuously intent upon states which are good, and upon making to become the states belonging to enlightenment.[1] It were good, honoured Ānanda, that you should explain this matter to the lord."

"Very well, your reverences," he said. And the venerable Ānanda having answered the dwellers in Vesālī, the sons of the Vajjins, went up to the lord. And, having come up to him, he told this matter to the lord.

"It is impossible, Ānanda, it cannot come to pass,[2] that the tathāgata should abolish the teaching on defeat which has been made known for the disciples, because of the deeds of the Vajjins or the sons of the Vajjins."

Then the lord for this reason, in this connection, having given talk on dhamma, addressed the monks thus:

"Monks, whatever monk should come, without having disavowed the training, without declaring his weakness, and indulge in sexual intercourse, he should not receive the upasampadā ordination. But, monks, if one comes, disavowing the training and declaring his weakness, yet indulging in sexual intercourse, he should receive the upasampadā ordination. And thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, possessed of the training and mode

[1] The term *bodhipakkhiyadhamma*, or as it is here *bodhipakkhika°*, is not usually considered to belong to the earlier literature. The later literature and *Comys.* reckon these states as thirty-seven. On their arrangement see Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Sakya*, p. 395, and *K.S.* V. vi.

[2] Following Woodward's translation at *G.S.* i. 25 and see *loc. cit.* n. 6. *VA.* 229 elucidates *anavakāso* by *kāraṇapaṭikkhepavacanaṃ*.

of life for monks, but not disavowing the training and not declaring his weakness, should indulge in sexual intercourse, even with an animal, is one who is defeated, he is not in communion." || 7 ||

Whatever means: he who, on account of his relations, on account of his social standing, on account of his name, [23] on account of his clan, on account of his morals, on account of his dwelling, on account of his field[1] (of activity), an elder[2] or a novice or one of middle standing:—this is called *whatever*.

Monk means: he is a monk because he is a beggar for alms, a monk because he submits to wandering for alms, a monk because he is one who wears the patchwork cloth, a monk by the designation (of others), a monk on account of his acknowledgment; a monk is called "Come, monk," a monk is endowed with going to the three refuges, a monk is auspicious, a monk is the essential, a monk is a learner, a monk is an adept, a monk means one who is endowed with harmony for the Order, with the resolution at which the motion is put three times and then followed by the decision,[3] with actions (in accordance with dhamma and the discipline),[4] with steadfastness, with the attributes of a man perfected.[5] Whatever monk is endowed with harmony for the Order, with the resolution at which the motion is put three times, and then followed by the decision, with actions (in accordance with dhamma and the discipline), with steadfastness and the attributes of a man perfected, this one is a *monk* as understood in this meaning.

Training means: the three trainings are—training in the higher morality, training in the higher thought,

---

[1] For definition of *gocara* see *Vbh*. 247.

[2] *VA*. 239, *thera* is one who has completed ten years; *nava*, a novice, is one of four years standing; and *majjhima* is one of more than five years standing.

[3] *ñatticatuttha*.

[4] So *VA*. 243.

[5] *Cf*. list of eighteen explanations of monk at *Vbh*. 245-6.

training in the higher wisdom. Here the training signified in this meaning is the training in the higher morality.

Mode of life is called whatever course of training is made known by the lord: this is called *mode*. . . . One is trained in this, thereby one is called *possessed of the mode*. . . . || 1 ||

Not disavowing the training, not declaring his weakness means: there is, monks, both the declaration of weakness, the training not being disavowed; and there is, monks, the declaration of weakness, the training being disavowed.

And how, monks, is there declaration of weakness with the training not disavowed? Here, monks, the monk who is chafing, dissatisfied, desirous of passing from the state of a recluse, anxious, troubled and ashamed[1] at being a monk, longing to be a householder, longing to be a lay-follower, longing to be a park-attendant, longing to be a novice, longing to belong to another sect, longing to be a disciple of another sect, longing not to be a recluse, longing not to be a son of the Sakyans—(such a monk) says, and declares: 'What now if I were to disavow the enlightened one?' Thus, monks, there is both a declaration of weakness and the training not disavowed. Then further, a chafing, dissatisfied . . . longing not to be a son of the Sakyans, says and declares: 'What now if I were to disavow dhamma?' . . . he says, he declares: 'What now the Order . . . what now the training . . . what now the discipline . . . what now the Pāṭimokkha . . . what now the exposition . . . what [24] now the preceptor . . . what now the teacher . . . what now the fellow-monk . . . what now the novice . . . what now the preceptors of my equals . . . what now the teachers of my equals . . . what now if I were to disavow the Brahma-life?' . . . he speaks, he declares: 'What now

[1] For these three words, *cf. D.* i. 213, where Gotama is made to use them in reference to the exercise of supernormal powers.

if I were a householder?' . . . he says, he declares: 'What now if I were a lay-follower . . . what now if I were a park-attendant . . . what now if I were a novice . . . what now if I were an adherent of another sect . . . what now if I were a disciple of another sect . . . what now if I were not a recluse . . . what now if I were not a son of the Sakyans?' Thus, monks, there is a declaration of weakness, the training not having been disavowed.

Then further, a chafing, dissatisfied . . . longing not to be a son of the Sakyans says, declares: 'But if I were to disavow the enlightened one' . . . he says, he declares: 'But if I were not a son of the Sakyans' . . . he says, he declares: 'And I should disavow the enlightened one' . . . he says, he declares: 'And I should not be a son of the Sakyans' . . . he says, he declares: 'Come now, I should disavow the enlightened one' . . . he says, he declares: 'Come now, I should not be a son of the Sakyans' . . . he says, he declares: 'The enlightened one is disavowed by me' . . . he says, he declares: 'There is no existence as a son of the Sakyans for me.' Thus, monks, is there a declaration of weakness and the training is not disavowed.

Then further, a chafing, dissatisfied . . . longing not to be a son of the Sakyans, says, declares: 'I remember my mother . . . I remember my father . . . I remember my brother . . . I remember my sister . . . I remember my son . . . I remember my daughter . . . I remember my wife . . . I remember my relations . . . I remember my friends . . . I remember the village . . . I remember the town . . . I remember the rice-field . . . I remember my property . . . I remember my gold coins . . . I remember my gold . . . I remember my crafts . . . I remember early laughter . . . prattle and amusement.' Thus, monks, [25] there is a declaration of weakness, the training not having been disavowed.

Then further, a chafing, dissatisfied . . . longing not to be a son of the Sakyans says, declares: 'I have a mother, she ought to be supported by me . . . I have

a father, he ought to be supported by me . . . I have a brother, he ought to be supported by me . . . I have a sister, she ought to be supported by me . . . I have a son . . . I have a daughter . . . I have a wife . . . I have relations, they ought to be supported by me . . . I have friends, they ought to be supported by me.' Thus, monks, there is a declaration of weakness, the training not having been disavowed.

Then further, a chafing, dissatisfied . . . longing not to be a son of the Sakyans says, declares: 'I have a mother, she will support me . . . I have a father, he will support me . . . I have friends, they will support me . . . I have a village, I will live by means of it . . . I have a town, I will live by means of it . . . rice-fields . . . property . . . gold coins . . . gold . . . I have crafts, I will live by means of them.' . . . Thus, monks, there is a declaration of weakness, the training not having been disavowed.

Then further, a chafing, dissatisfied . . . longing not to be a son of the Sakyans says, declares: 'This is difficult to do . . . this is not easy to do . . . this is difficult . . . this is not easy . . . I am unable . . . I cannot endure . . . I do not enjoy myself . . . I take no delight.'[1] Thus, monks, there is a declaration of weakness, the training not having been disavowed." || 2 ||

And how, monks, is there a declaration of weakness with the training being disavowed? Here, monks, a monk who is dissatisfied, chafing . . . longing not to be a son of the Sakyans says, declares: 'I disavow the enlightened one.' This, monks, is a declaration of weakness and the training being disavowed.

Then further, a chafing, dissatisfied . . . longing not to be a son of the Sakyans says, declares: 'I disavow dhamma . . . [26] I disavow the Order . . . the training . . . the discipline . . . the Pāṭimokkha . . . the exposition . . . the preceptor . . . the teacher . . . my fellow-monks . . . the novice . . . the preceptor of

[1] See n. 1, p. 114.

my fellows . . . the teacher of my fellows . . . I disavow the Brahma-life . . .'; . . . says, declares: 'I will be a householder . . . I will be a lay-follower . . . a park-attendant . . . a novice . . . an adherent of another sect . . . a disciple of another sect . . . not a recluse . . . I will not be a son of the Sakyans.' Thus, monks, there is a declaration of weakness with the training being disavowed.

Then further, a chafing, dissatisfied . . . longing not to be a son of the Sakyans, says, declares: 'I am tired of the enlightened one . . . I am tired of the Brahma-life.' This, monks . . .

Then further . . . says, declares: 'What is the enlightened one to me? . . . What is the Brahma-life to me?' This, monks . . .

Then further . . . says, declares: 'The enlightened one means nothing to me . . . The Brahma-life means nothing to me.' This, monks . . .

Then further . . . says, declares: 'I am well freed with regard to the enlightened one . . . I am well freed with regard to the Brahma-life.' This, monks . . . being disavowed.

Then there are these other attributes of the enlightened one, or of dhamma, or of the Order, or of the training . . . or of the Brahma-life, or of the householder . . . or of one who is not a son of the Sakyans; he speaks, he declares by reason of these properties, by reason of these features, by reason of these signs. Thus, monks, there is a declaration of weakness, the training having been disavowed. || 3 ||

And how, monks, is the training not disavowed? Here, monks, by reason of these properties, by reason of these features, by reason of these signs, the training is disavowed, yet if one who is out of his mind disavows the training by reason of these properties, by reason of these features, by reason of these signs, then the training is not disavowed. If one disavows the training in the presence of one who is out of his mind, the training is not disavowed. If one whose mind is unhinged disavows

the training . . . if one disavows the training in the presence of one whose mind is unhinged . . . if one is afflicted with pain . . . in the presence of one afflicted by pain . . . in the presence of devatās[1] . . . if one disavows the training in the presence of animals, the training is not disavowed. If an ariyan[2] disavows the training in the presence of a non-ariyan[3] and he does not recognise it, the training is not disavowed. If a non-ariyan in the presence of an ariyan . . . if an ariyan in the presence of an ariyan . . . if a non-ariyan [27] disavows the training in the presence of a non-ariyan and he does not recognise it, the training is not disavowed. If he disavows the training for a joke . . . he disavows the training for fun . . . if he announces what he does not wish to announce . . . if he does not announce what he wishes to announce . . . if he announces to those not knowing . . . if he does not announce to those knowing . . . or if he does not announce the whole thing, the training is not disavowed. This, monks, is the training which is not disavowed. ||4||

Sexual intercourse means: what is not verily dhamma, village dhamma, low-caste dhamma, wickedness, the final ablution, secrecy, having obtained in couples: this is called *sexual intercourse.*

Indulges means: whenever the male organ is made to enter the female, the male member to enter the female, even for the length of a fruit of the sesame plant, this is called *indulges.*

Even with an animal means: indulging in sexual intercourse with a female animal,[4] he is not a (true) recluse,

[1] *VA.* 255, from the earth devatās to the devatās of the Akaniṭṭha realm.

[2] *VA.* 255, *ariyaka* means the proper mode of speech, the language of Magadha. Note the form *ariyaka.*

[3] *milakkhuka. Cf.* Mlecchas, now a term for all non-caste people. Here perhaps the aboriginal inhabitants of India. *VA.* 255 says, *nāma yo koci anariyako Andha-Damiḷādi,* the people of Andha (*i.e.* the Telugus) and the Tamils, *cf. VbhA.* 387, 388.

[4] *Tiracchānagatitthi,* lit. a woman gone to the animals. *Cf.* below, p. 212.

not a (true) son of the Sakyans, much less so than with women: hence the meaning is *even with an animal.*

Is one who is defeated means: as a man with his head cut off cannot become[1] one to live with that bodily connection, so is a monk indulging in sexual intercourse not a (true) recluse, not a (true) son of the Sakyans[2]: therefore he is called *one who is defeated.*

Is not in communion means: *communion*[3] is called one work, one rule, an equal training, this is called communion. He who is not together with this is therefore called *not in communion.* || 5 || **8** ||

Three kinds of females: human women, non-human females, female animals. Three kinds of hermaphrodites: human hermaphrodites, non-human hermaphrodites, animal hermaphrodites. Three kinds of eunuchs: human eunuchs, non-human eunuchs, animal eunuchs. Three kinds of males: human males, non-human males, animal males. There is an offence involving defeat if he commits sexual intercourse with human women *in three ways. Also with non-human women and with female animals. Also with human, non-human and animal hermaphrodites. There is an offence involving defeat for a human eunuch if he commits sexual intercourse *in two ways. Also non-human and animal eunuchs. There is an offence involving defeat for human males, non-human males and male animals if they commit sexual intercourse *in these two ways. || 1 || [28]

For a monk who, having thought of cohabitation, lets his male organ enter a human woman *at any one of the three places, there is an offence involving defeat.

[1] *Abhabba.*

[2] *Cf. Vin.* i. 96.

[3] *Saṃvāsa,* lit. living with, co-residence. It often refers to the household life, as at *A.* ii. 57, 187; iii. 164; iv. 174; *Sn.* 283, 290; but in *Vin.* it is a term of importance in religion.

For a monk who . . . a non-human female, a female animal . . . a human, non-human, an animal hermaphrodite *at any one of the three places, there is an offence involving defeat. For a monk who . . . a human, non-human or animal eunuch . . . a human male, a non-human male or a male animal . . . involving defeat. || 2 ||

Opponents of monks having brought a human woman into a monk's presence associate his male organ *with these three places. If he agrees to application, if he agrees to entry, if he agrees to remaining, if he agrees to taking out, there is an offence involving defeat. Opponents of monks . . . if he does not agree to application, but agrees to entry, to remaining, to taking out, there is an offence involving defeat.

Opponents of monks . . . if he does not agree to application, nor to entry, but to remaining and to taking out . . . involving defeat. Opponents of monks . . . if he does not agree to application nor to entry nor to remaining, but to taking out . . . involving defeat. Opponents of monks . . . if he does not agree to application nor to entry nor to remaining nor to taking out, there is no offence.

Opponents of monks, having brought a human woman awake . . . asleep . . . intoxicated . . . mad . . . drunk . . . dead but undecomposed . . . dead and practically undecomposed . . . *dead and practically decomposed . . . involving defeat. [29] If he agrees to its application, to its entry, to its remaining, to taking it out, there is a grave offence . . . if he does not agree, there is no offence.

(All this is repeated for non-human females, female animals; human, non-human, animal hermaphrodites; human, non-human, animal eunuchs; human men, non-human males, male animals.) || 3 ||

Opponents of monks, having brought a human woman [30] into a monk's presence, associate his male organ *at the three places, the woman being covered, the monk uncovered . . . ; . . . the woman uncovered,

the monk covered . . .; . . . the woman covered, the monk covered . . .; . . . the woman uncovered, the monk uncovered. If he agrees to its application, to its entry, to its remaining, to taking it out, there is an offence involving defeat. If not, there is no offence. Opponents of monks . . . a human woman awake . . . asleep . . . . dead but practically undecomposed . . . involving defeat . . . dead, but practically decomposed . . . the woman being covered, the monk uncovered . . . both being uncovered. If he agrees . . . there is a grave offence. If not, there is no offence.

(All this is repeated for a non-human female, female animal; human, non-human and animal hermaphrodite; human, non-human and animal eunuch; human males, non-human males and male-animals.) || 4 ||

Vin. iii. 32-33, §§ 5, 6 are repetitions of §§ 3, 4 but reading " opponents of monks, having brought a monk into the presence of a human woman . . ." || 5 || 6 ||

In as much as *opponents of monks* have been explained, so should be explained opponents as kings, opponents as thieves, opponents as scoundrels, opponents as "the scent of lotuses."[1] *Covered* has been commented upon.

He lets the way enter by the way, there is an offence involving defeat. He lets what is not the way enter by the way, . . . involving defeat. He lets the way enter by what is not the way . . . involving defeat. He lets what is not the way enter by what is not the way, there is a grave offence. A monk commits sin with a sleeping monk. Awakened he agrees; both should be expelled.[2] Awakened he does not agree; the defiler

---

[1] *Uppalagandha*, perhaps a soubriquet of some brigands. *VA*. 268 says they needed human hearts: except monks, men were rare. Monks should not be murdered, so the brigands led them astray by bringing women to them. *Cf. ItA*. ii. 57.

[2] *nāsetabbo*. I follow the rendering of *Vin. Texts* i. 215, which seems to suit the context better than the " to atone " of the *P.T.S. Dict*. *Nāseti* is the caus. of *nassati*, to disappear, to come to an end. *Cf*. below, pp. 62, 280.

should be expelled. A monk commits sin with a sleeping novice. Awakened he agrees; both should be expelled. Awakened he does not agree; the defiler should be expelled. A novice commits sin with a sleeping monk. Awakened he agrees; both should be expelled. A novice commits sin with a sleeping novice. Awakened . . . should be expelled. || 7 ||

If one is ignorant, if one has not agreed, if one is mad, unhinged, afflicted with pain, or a beginner, there is no offence. || 8 || **9** ||

Told is the Recital on Covering

The female monkey, and sons of the Vajjins, a householder and a naked one, adherents of another sect,
The girl, and Uppalavaṇṇā, then two about characteristics, /
Mother, daughter, and sister, and wife, supple, pendent, [33]
Two sores, and a plaster decoration, and a wooden doll, /
Five with Sundara,[1] five about cemeteries, bones,
A female nāga and a female yakkha, and a female peta, a eunuch, impaired, he touched, /
In Bhaddiya, the man perfected, asleep, then four on Sāvatthī,
Three on Vesālī, garlands,[2] the Bharukaccha monk in his dream, /

[1] *Sundarena saha pañca.* As there is only one episode recounted about Sundara below, this possibly means the five actions that the woman did in connection with him: she said two things to him, did him homage, lifted his robe and took hold of him, see below, || 11 ||. Or there may have been other stories referred to, but which have not survived.

[2] This is printed as *Mallā.* But the section || 21 || below to which this heading refers has nothing to do with the Mallians, but it does have to do with garlands, *mālā.* I have therefore rendered it thus above. Oldenberg suggests the emendation at *Vin.* iii. 269, *mālā*; but *mallā* may be correct (= *malyā*).

Supabbā, Saddhā, a nun, a female probationer, and a female novice,
A prostitute, a eunuch, a householder, one another, one who had gone forth when old, a deer.

Now at that time a certain monk *committed fornication with a female monkey. On account of this he was remorseful. He said, "The course of training has been made known by the lord. I hope that I have not fallen into an offence entailing defeat."[1] He told this matter to the lord . . . "You, monk, have fallen into an offence entailing defeat," he said. || 1 ||

Now at that time a great company of monks, dwellers in Vesālī, and of the Vajji clan, not disavowing the training and not declaring their weakness, indulged in sexual intercourse. On account of this they were remorseful, and said: "The course of training has been made known by the lord. Let us hope that we have not fallen into an offence entailing defeat." They told this matter to the lord . . . ". . . You, monks, have fallen into an offence entailing defeat," he said. || 2 ||

Now at that time, a certain monk saying: "There will be no offence for me," committed sexual intercourse (wearing) the characteristic (white dress) of a layman. On account of this he was remorseful . . . ". . . defeat," he said.

Now at that time a certain monk being naked committed sexual intercourse, saying: "There will be no offence for me." On account of this he was remorseful . . . ". . . defeat," he said.

Now at that time a certain monk saying: "There will be no offence for me," clad in a kusa-grass garment[2]

---

[1] Here and following: *pārājikaṃ āpattiṃ āpanno,* instead of the more usual, *āpatti pārājikassa.*

[2] At *A.* i. 240=295=ii. 206=*Vin.* i. 305=*D.* i. 167 these various sorts of garments are given. At *Vin.* i. 305 monks, including the one who was *nagga* are also given in this order.

. . . clad in a bark garment[1] . . . clad in a garment of wood shavings[1] . . . clad in a hair blanket[2] . . . clad in a blanket made of horse-hair . . . clad in a dress of owls' wings . . . clad in a cloak made of strips of a black antelope's hide,[3] indulged in sexual intercourse. On account of this he was remorseful . . . " . . . entailing defeat," he said. || 3 ||

Now at one time a certain monk as he was wandering for alms, seeing a little girl lying on her back, was enamoured of her and *made his thumb enter her, and she died. On account of this he was remorseful . . . " . . . Monk, there is not an offence involving defeat; there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order,"[4] he said. || 4 || [34]

Now at one time a certain brahmin youth was in love with the nun Uppalavaṇṇā.[5] Then this brahmin youth,

[1] *Cf. D.* i. 166-7 for these words. At *Jā.* i. 356 we get *purisaṃ phalakaṃ katvā*, trans. " making this man my stalking-horse," which editor suggests, *Vin. Texts* ii. 246, " may be a figure of speech founded on the use of this word and mean ' making him his covering.' "

[2] As Ajita Kesakambalin, see *D.* i. 55.

[3] *VA.* 272, " with the hair and hooves."

[4] See below, p. 195, n. 1.

[5] *Thig.*, ver. 224 ff., *ThigA.* 190; *DhA.* ii. 48 ff. and *AA.* i. 355-356 all relate how she had power in the sphere of light (*cf.* Dabba, in *Saṅgh.* VIII. below), and say that she was born at Sāvatthī in the family of a great merchant. *DhA.* ii. 49 tells much the same story as that given above, her assaulter there being a young kinsman, and it says that she went into the Dark Wood, because at that time forest-dwelling for nuns had not been forbidden. In *Nissaggiya* V. she is also said to have entered the Dark Wood. There is no doubt, I think, that the Uppalavaṇṇā of *Vin.* iii. 35 above and of *DhA.* are one and the same. That the Uppalavaṇṇā of Thig. is the same is less likely. For though some of the thoughts there attributed to her might be construed to be the outcome of her adventures, the main episode of her life as represented in Thig., is that of being her mother's co-wife. Nothing is said of this surely very unusual situation in either *DhA.* or *AA.* *VA.* gives no story. It may be that *DhA.* and *AA.* have welded the story of the two Uppalavaṇṇās into one story. Such a welding of two stories into one has a parallel in the story of Kisāgotamī, *Pss. Sisters,* p. 109,

when the nun Uppalavaṇṇā had gone into the village for alms, entered the hut and sat down, concealed. The nun Uppalavaṇṇā, after the meal and when she had finished eating, washing her feet and entering the hut, sat down on the couch. Then the brahmin youth, taking up the nun Uppalavaṇṇā, assaulted her. The nun Uppalavaṇṇā told this matter to the nuns. The nuns told this matter to the monks.[1] The monks told this matter to the lord. He said: "There is no offence, monks, as she was not willing." || 5 ||

Now at one time the sign of a woman[2] appeared to a monk. They told this matter to the lord. He said: "Monks, I allow a teacher[3] to meet with the nuns during the rains, as for the upasampadā ordination, so as in the presence of nuns to turn the nuns away from those offences which they have in common with monks; but in those offences of monks which are offences not in common with nuns, there is no offence (for the nuns)."

Now at that time the sign of a male appeared to a nun. They told this matter to the lord. He said: "Monks, I allow a teacher to meet with the monks during the rains, as for the upasampadā ordination, so as in the presence of monks to turn the monks away from those offences which they have in common with nuns, but in those offences of nuns which are offences not in common with monks, there is no offence (for the monks)." || 6 ||

---

with which *cf.* the story of Paṭācārā, *Pss. Sisters*, p. 70. At *A.* i. 24 Uppalavaṇṇā is called chief of the disciples who are nuns having psychic potencies; and at *A.* i. 88 she and Khemā are taken as the standard and measure by which to estimate the disciples who are nuns. See Horner, *Women under Primitive Buddhism*, p. 168 f.

[1] In no passage are the nuns recorded to tell the matter to the lord direct, but always through the medium of the monks. An exception to this is in the case of his aunt Mahāpajāpatī.

[2] *Itthiliṅga.*

[3] *Taṃ yeva upajjhaṃ taṃ eva upasampadaṃ*, explained at *VA.* 273 as *pubbe gahitaupajjhaṃ eva pubbe 'kataupsampadaṃ eva ca anujānāmi*, which seems to mean: I allow the teacher who was taken before, the upasampadā that was conferred before . . .

Now at that time, a certain monk thinking: "There will be no offence for me," indulged in sexual intercourse with his mother . . . his daughter . . . his sister. On account of this he was remorseful . . . He told this matter to the lord, who said: "You, monk, have fallen into an offence involving defeat."

Now at that time, a certain monk indulged in sexual intercourse with his former wife. On account of this he was remorseful . . . ". . . involving defeat." || 7 ||

Now at that time a certain monk had a supple back.[1] Tormented by chafing,[2] he took hold of *his own male organ. On account of this he was remorseful . . . ". . . involving defeat."

Now at that time a certain monk was able to bend down his male organ. Tormented by chafing,[2] *he committed a perversion. On account of this, he was remorseful . . . ". . . involving defeat." || 8 || [35]

Now at that time a certain monk saw a dead body, and on the body . . . *was a sore. He, thinking: "There will be no offence for me," *had illicit relations. On account of this he was remorseful . . . ". . . involving defeat."

(*Another case of this sort) || 9 ||

Now at that time a certain monk, inflamed, *had illicit relations with a plaster decoration.[3] On account of this he was remorseful . . . ". . . Monk, it is not an offence involving defeat; it is an offence of wrong-doing."

Now at that time a certain monk, inflamed, *had illicit relations with a wooden doll.[4] On account of this he was remorseful . . . ". . . of wrong-doing." || 10 ||

---

[1] *VA.* 177, he had formerly been a dancer.

[2] See below, p. 114, n. 1.

[3] *Lepacitta. VA.* 278 says *cittakammarūpa.*

[4] *Dārudhītalikā. VA.* 278 says *kaṭṭharūpa.*

Now at that time the monk called Sundara, who had gone forth from Rājagaha, was walking along a carriage-road. A certain woman said: "Wait, honoured sir, for a moment, I will pay homage to you." As she was paying homage she held up his inner garment and took hold of *his male organ. On account of this he was remorseful. . . . ". . . Monk, did you agree?"

"I did not agree, lord," he said.[1]

"There is no offence, monk, as you did not agree." || 11 ||

Now at one time a certain woman seeing a monk, spoke thus: "Come, honoured sir, indulge in sexual intercourse."

"Not so, sister, that is not proper for me."

"Come, honoured sir, I will exert myself, do not you exert yourself, thus there will be no offence for you." The monk acted accordingly. On account of this he was remorseful . . . ". . . involving defeat."

Now at that time a certain woman seeing a monk, spoke thus: "Come, honoured sir, indulge in sexual intercourse."

"Not so, sister, that is not proper for me."

"Come, honoured sir, you exert yourself, I will not exert myself, thus there will be no offence for you." The monk acted accordingly. On account of this he was remorseful . . . ". . . involving defeat."

Now at that time a certain woman seeing a monk spoke thus: "Come, honoured sir . . ." ". . . not proper for me."

"Come, honoured sir, *touching the inner parts, discharge semen . . . touching the outer parts, discharge semen. Thus there will be no offence for you." The monk acted accordingly. On account of this he was remorseful . . . ". . . involving defeat." || 12 ||

Now at one time a certain monk going to a cemetery and seeing a body not yet decomposed indulged in sexual

[1] *VA.* 278 says he was a non-returner, therefore he did not agree.

intercourse with it. [36] On account of this he was remorseful . . . " . . . involving defeat."

Now at that time a certain monk going to a cemetery and seeing a body which was practically undecomposed . . . " . . . involving defeat."

Now at that time a certain monk going to a cemetery and seeing a body which was practically decomposed . . . " . . . Monk, there is no offence involving defeat, there is a grave offence."

Now at that time a certain monk going to a cemetery and seeing a decapitated head, *behaved wrongly, touching its mouth. On account of this he was remorseful. . . . " . . . You, monk, have fallen into an offence involving defeat."

Now at that time a certain monk going to a cemetery and seeing a decapitated head, *behaved wrongly, but not touching its mouth. On account of this he was remorseful . . . " Monk, there is no offence involving defeat, there is an offence of wrong-doing."

Now at that time a certain monk was in love with a certain woman. She died, and her bones were thrown in the charnel-ground and scattered. Then the monk, going to the cemetery, collected the bones and *behaved in an unsuitable way. On account of this he was remorseful. . . . " . . . Monk, there is no offence involving defeat, there is an offence of wrong-doing." || 13 ||

Now at that time a certain monk indulged in sexual intercourse with a female nāga[1] . . . with a female yakkha[2] . . . with a female departed one[3] . . . with

[1] *VA*. 279 says " whether it is a young female *nāgā* (*nāgamāṇavikā*, *cf*. *Jā*. iii. 275 and *DhA*. iii. 232, trans. at *Buddhist Legends*, iii. 57 as ' dragon-maiden ') or a *kinnarī* " (birds [?] living in the heart of mountains); *cf*. *ThigA*. 255.

[2] *VA*. 279, " the female yakkhas are all devatās."

[3] *VA*. 279, " the *nijjhāmataṇhika petīs* and so on are not to be approached, but there are *petīs* who live in mansions; the demerit of these matures during the dark half of the month, but in the light half they experience bliss like devatās." The *nijjhāmataṇhika petas* are consumed by thirst. At *Miln*. 294 it is said that they do not derive benefit from offerings made by their living relatives. *Cf*. *Miln*. 303, 357.

a eunuch. On account of this he was remorseful . . . " . . . involving defeat." || 14 ||

Now at that time a certain monk's faculties were impaired.[1] Saying: "I feel neither ease nor discomfort, thus there will be no offence for me," he indulged in sexual intercourse. They told this matter to the lord. He said: "Monks, whether this foolish man felt or did not feel,[2] there is an offence involving defeat." || 15 ||

Now at that time a certain monk, saying: "I will indulge in sexual intercourse with a woman," was conscience-stricken at the mere touch . . . "Monk, there is no offence involving defeat, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order." || 16 ||

Now at that time a certain monk was lying down in the Jātiyā Grove at Bhaddiya,[3] having gone there for the day-sojourn. All his limbs were stiff with pain. A certain woman seeing him, sat down *on him, and having taken her pleasure, departed. The monks, seeing that he was wet,[4] told this matter to the lord. [37] He said . . . " *. . . Monks, this monk is a man perfected; monks, there is no offence for this monk." || 17 ||

Now at that time a certain monk was lying down, having gone to the Dark Wood at Sāvatthī for the day-sojourn. A certain woman cowherd seeing him, sat down *on him. The monk consented . . . On account of this he was remorseful. . . . "You, monk, have fallen into an offence involving defeat."

Now at that time a certain monk . . . at Sāvatthī . . . A certain woman goatherd seeing him . . . a certain woman gathering fire-wood seeing him . . . a certain

[1] *upahatindriya.*

[2] *vedayi vā . . . na vā vedayi.*

[3] The capital of the Aṅga kingdom. Here lived Meṇḍaka, famed for his psychic potency, *Vin.* i. 240 ff. The town is mentioned also at *Vin.* i. 189, 190; *A.* iii. 36.

[4] *kilinna.*

woman gathering cow-dung seeing him, sat down *on him . . . ". . . involving defeat." || 18 ||

Now at one time a certain monk was lying down, having gone into the Great Wood at Vesālī for the day-sojourn. A certain woman seeing him, sat down *on him, and having taken her pleasure, stood laughing near by. The monk, waking up, spoke thus to this woman: " Have you done this ?"

" Yes, I have," she said. On account of this he was remorseful . . .

" Monk, did you consent ?"

" I did not know, lord," he said.

" Monk, there is no offence as you did not know." || 19 ||

Now at that time a certain monk was lying down, resting against a tree, having gone into the Great Wood at Vesālī for the day-sojourn. A certain woman, seeing him, sat down *on him. The monk got up hastily. On account of this he was remorseful . . . " Monk, did you consent ?"

" I did not consent, lord," he said.

" Monk, there is no offence as you did not consent."

Now at that time a certain monk was lying down, resting against a tree, having gone into the Great Wood at Vesālī for the day-sojourn. A certain woman, seeing him, sat down *on him. The monk, rising (quickly), knocked her over.[1] On account of this he was remorseful . . . " Monk, did you consent ?"

" I did not consent, lord," he said.

" Monk, there is no offence as you did not consent." || 20 ||

---

[1] *akkamitvā pavaṭṭesi*. *VA*. 280 says that the monk, rising suddenly and giving a kick (*akkamitvā*), knocked her over in such a way that she rolled on the ground. The same expression recurs below, p. 138, in connection with a mortar. The *Comy*. on this passage, *VA*. 475 gives *akkamitvā* in explanation of *ottharitvā*, which seems to mean " sitting on." *Tr. Cr. Pali Dict.* says that *akkamati* is " to make a kick at one," and in that connection cites the above passage. *P.T.S. Dict.*, evidently following the *Comy.*, gives " to rise " for this passage.

Now at that time a certain monk, in the Gabled Hall in the Great Wood at Vesālī for his day-sojourn, was lying down having opened the door. All his limbs were stiff with pains. Now at that time a large company of women, bringing scents [38] and garlands, came to the park looking at the vihāra. Then these women seeing that monk, sat down *on him, and having taken their pleasure and saying: "Isn't he a bull of a man[1]?" departed, piling up their scents and garlands. The monks, seeing the moisture, told this matter to the lord. He said . . . (*cf.* ||17||) ". . . Monks, there is no offence for this monk. I allow you, monks, when you are in seclusion for meditation during the day, to meditate in seclusion, having closed the door." || 21 ||

Now at that time a certain monk of Bharukaccha,[2] having dreamed that he committed sexual intercourse with his former wife, said: "I am not a (true) recluse, I will leave the Order,"[3] and going to Bharukaccha, and seeing the venerable Upāli[4] on the road, he told him

[1] *purisusabha.*

[2] *Bhārukacchako bhikkhu.* Bharukaccha was a town, see *Jā.* iii. 188; and *Pss. Breth.*, p. 194, *Pss. Sisters*, p. 103; here Vaḍḍha and his mother were said to have been born. Professor E. Müller, *J.P.T.S.* 1888, p. 63, says that Bharukacchaka is a monk; but he is mentioned nowhere but here. At *Miln.* 331 the inhabitants of the town are called Bhārukacchakā. *Pss. Sisters*, p. 103, n. 1, calls it "a seaport on the north-west seaboard, the Bharoch of today."

[3] *Vibbhamissāmi. P.T.S. Dict.*, referring to the above passage, says "co-habiting." But see below, p. 114, for an exact repetition of this phrase, where it is probably to be taken in its sense of "to leave the Order." The question is, does the text of the above passage justify the Dictionary's rendering? It is as easy to believe that the monk was merely returning to his former home as that he was declaring his intention of returning to his former wife. On the other hand, on p. 62 below, *vibbhama* possibly means "cohabit." At p. 323 below, *vibbh°* probably means "left the Order." Doubtless this meaning carried the other with it. See also p. 114 and n. 3.

[4] At *A.* i. 25 he is called "chief among those who know the disciplinary rules by heart," quoted by *VA.* 283. Verses at *Thag.* 249-251, see *Pss. Breth.* 168. *Cf. Vin. Texts* ii. 276, n. 1; Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 217.

this matter. The venerable Upāli said: "There is no offence, your reverence, since it was in a dream." ||22||

Now at that time in Rājagaha there was a female lay-follower, called Supabbā,[1] who believed in the enlightened one. She held this view: whatever (woman) gives sexual intercourse, gives the highest gift. Seeing a monk she spoke thus: "Come, honoured sir, indulge in sexual intercourse."

"Not so, sister, it is not fitting," he said.

"Come, honoured sir, (only) touch the region of the breasts, thus there will be no offence for you . . . Come, honoured sir, (only) touch the navel . . . the stomach . . . the waist . . . the throat . . . the ear . . . the coil of hair . . . the spaces between the fingers . . . Come, honoured sir, approaching (me only) with (your) hands, I will make you *function, thus there will be no offence for you." The monk acted accordingly. On account of this he was remorseful. "Monk, there is no offence involving defeat; there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order." ||23||

Now at that time at Sāvatthī was a female lay-disciple, called Saddhā, who believed in the enlightened one. She held this view: whatever (woman) gives sexual intercourse, gives the highest gift. Seeing a monk, she spoke thus: "Come, honoured sir, indulge in sexual intercourse."

"Not so, sister, it is not fitting."

"Come, honoured sir, touch the region of the breasts. . . . Come, honoured sir, approaching (me only) with (your) hands, I will make you *function, thus there will be no offence for you." The monk acted accordingly. On account of this he was remorseful. "Monk, there is no offence involving defeat, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order." ||24||

Now at that time at Vesālī some Licchavi youths, taking hold of a monk, made him commit sin with a

[1] Mentioned, I think, nowhere but here.

nun. [39] Both agreed, then both should be expelled.[1] Neither agreed, there was no offence for either.

Now at that time at Vesālī some Licchavi youths, taking hold of a monk, made him commit sin with a female probationer . . . with a female novice. Both agreed, then both should be expelled. Neither agreed, there was no offence for either.

Now at that time at Vesālī some Licchavi youths, taking hold of a monk, made him commit sin with a prostitute[2] . . . with an eunuch . . . with a woman householder. The monk agreed, then the monk should be expelled. The monk did not agree, then there is no offence for the monk.

Now at that time at Vesālī some Licchavi youths taking hold of (some) monks made them commit sin with one another. Both agreed, then both should be expelled. Neither agreed, there is no offence for either. || 25 ||

Now at that time a certain monk who had long gone forth, went to see his former wife. She said, "Come, honoured sir, leave the Order,"[3] and she took hold of him. The monk, stepping backwards, fell down on his back.[4] She, bending him up,[5] sat down *on him. On account of this he was remorseful. . . . They told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Monk, did you consent ?"

"I did not consent, lord," he said.

"There is no offence, monk, as you did not consent." || 26 ||

Now at that time a certain monk dwelt in the jungle. A young deer, coming up, (*made that monk consent to

[1] *nāsetabbo*. *Cf.* above, p. 50.

[2] *vesī*, or low-caste woman.

[3] *vibbhama*, see above p. 60, n. 3.

[4] *VA*. 284, says that he stepped back to free himself from her grasp, but fell down as he was weak through old age. But he was a non-returner, one who had cut off passion and sense-desires, therefore he did not consent.

[5] *ubbhujitvā*. *Cf. Vin*. ii. 222.

what it wanted to do). On account of this he was remorseful. He told this matter to the lord. He said: "You, monk, have fallen into an offence involving defeat." || 27 || **10** ||

Told is the First Offence involving Defeat[1]. [**40**]

[1] *samattaṃ*, instead of the more usual *niṭṭhitaṃ*.

DEFEAT (PĀRĀJIKA) II

At one time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Rājagaha on the slopes of the Vulture's Peak. Now at that time a large company of monks who were friends and comrades, having made a grass hut on the Isigili mountain-slope,[1] went up there for the rains. Also the venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son, having made a grass hut, went up there for the rains. Then these monks having spent the rains for three months, demolished the grass huts, and having put away the grass and wood, departed on tour into the country. But the venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son, spent the rains there, the cold weather there, the hot weather there. Then when the venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son, had gone into the village for alms, women, gathering grass, gathering firewood, demolished the grass hut, and went away taking the grass and wood. A second time did the venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son, having collected grass and wood, make a grass hut. A second time, when the venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son, had gone into the village for alms, women, gathering grass, gathering firewood, destroyed the grass hut, and went away taking the grass and wood. A third time did the venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son, having collected grass and wood, make a grass hut. A third time, when the venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son, had gone into the village for alms, women, gathering grass, gathering firewood, demolished the grass hut, and went away taking the grass and wood. Then the venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son, thought: "For the third

[1] One of the group of hills above Rājagaha, whence the other crests could be seen (*M.* iii. 68, ff.); a resort of the Order, *Vin.* ii. 76; where Godhika committed suicide, *S.* i. 120; *cf. D.* ii. 116.

time, when I have gone into the village for alms, women, gathering grass, gathering firewood, demolished the grass hut, and went away taking the grass and wood. But I am well taught, experienced in my own craft, accomplished in the potter's craft. What now, if I, kneading mire myself, should make a hut consisting of nothing but mud?" Then the venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son, kneading mire himself, [**41**] making a hut consisting of nothing but mud, collecting grass and wood and cow-dung, baked this hut. It was a beautiful, lovely, pleasing red hut, just like a little lady-bird[1]; and just like the sound of a small bell, so was the sound of this hut. || 1 ||

Then the lord as he was descending from the slopes of the Vulture's Peak with a great company of monks, saw this beautiful, lovely, pleasing red hut, and seeing it he addressed the monks saying:

"Monks, what is this beautiful, lovely, pleasing red thing like a little lady-bird?" Then the monks told this matter to the lord. The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them saying:

"Monks, it is not suitable in this foolish man, it is not fit, it is not becoming, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not seemly, it should not be done. For how, monks, can this foolish man make a hut out of nothing but mud? Certainly, monks, this foolish man can have no consideration, compassion and mercy for creatures.[2]

---

[1] *Indagopaka*, lit. Indra's cowherds. *Comy.* makes no remark. But *cf. Thag.* 13 and *Pss. Breth.* 18, n., where it is said that "according to the (*Thag.*) Commentary these are coral-red insects, alluded to in connection with recent rain, but said by some to be a red grass." Note also here Sir Charles Eliot's remark that the Russians call lady-birds, "God's little cows." Dhaniya's hut might have been of a round kraal-like shape, suggesting a beetle's back. Monier Williams' *Sanskrit-English Dictionary* gives under *indragopaka*, "the insect cochineal of various kinds"; and *St. Petersburgh Dictionary* gives "Coccinelle." The coccineds are, however, lady-birds.

[2] *na hi nāma tassa moghapurisassa pāṇesu anuddayā anukampā avihesā bhavissati.* This must refer to the small creatures in the mud which would be destroyed when the mud was baked.

Go, monks, demolish this hut. Do not let the folk who come after bring downfall to creatures.[1] And, monks, a hut consisting of nothing but mud should not be made. Whoever shall make one—there is an offence of wrong-doing."[2]

"Very well, lord," the monks said, and having answered the lord they went up to the hut, and having

---

[1] *mā pacchimā janatā pāṇesu pātavyataṃ āpajji.* *VA.* 288 paraphrases *pacchimā janatā* by *janasamūho*, concourse or multitude of people. At *Vin.* ii. 128 we find *pacchimaṃ janataṃ tathāgato anukampati*, trans. at *Vin. Texts*, iii. 128, "The tathāgata has mercy even on the meanest thing." And at *M.* ii. 93, *pacchimaṃ janataṃ tathāgato apaloketi*, trans. at *Fur. Dial.* ii. 47, "The Truth-Finder is looking towards those that shall follow hereafter." *MA.* gives no help. *Pacchimaṃ janataṃ* at *A.* i. 61 is trans. at *G.S.* i. 55 as "future generations," with n. that "*Comy.* takes it to mean 'his disciples who come after.'" At *A.* iii. 108=251 we get *pacchimā janatā diṭṭhānugatiṃ āpajjati* (*āpajjissati*, 108), trans., *G.S.* iii. 86, 184, "and the folk who come after fall (will fall) into the way of wrong views." At *S.* ii. 203 we find *pacchimaṃ ca janataṃ anukampamāno appevanāma pacchimā janatā diṭṭhānugatiṃ āpajjeyyuṃ*, trans., *K.S.* ii. 136, "and being filled with compassion for them who will come after us. For surely these may fall into error." *SA.* makes no comment. Because of this array of translations of *pacchimā janatā* as "those who come after," I am reluctant to think that here it means "lowest or most backward persons"—in this case represented by Dhaniya. It was meant, I think, that it was a bad example if *he* should destroy creatures, for then those who might use the hut after him might destroy them. *Cf. pacchimaka bhikkhu*, above, p. 19; *D.* ii. 155; *A.* ii. 80.

Pātavyatā is paraphrased at *VA.* 288 as *pātabyabhāva*, and it is said that in the time of a Buddha the monks did bring "downfall to creatures, thinking that there was no fault in depriving them of life, falling into the way of wrong views (*diṭṭhānugatiṃ āpajjamānā*, *cf. A.* iii. 108=251) about this; so now it is said: 'Let not the lowest people think thus of the ruin (*pātabbe*, with v. 11 *pātabyate*, *pātabye*) and crushing (*ghaṃsitabbe*) of creatures." At *M.* i. 305=*A.* i. 266 we find *kāmesu pātavyataṃ āpajjati* (°*byatam āpajjanti*, *M.* i.), translated *Fur. Dial.* i. 219, "they give way to indulgence in pleasures of sense," and *G.S.* i. 244, "comes to be intoxicated with his lusts." Mr. Woodward says, *G.S.* i. 244, n. 2, that *Comy.* on *A.* appears to derive *pātavyata* from √*piv.*, intoxication, as does *UdA.* 351, 365, as he points out. So also does *MA.* ii. 371. But such a derivation is not hinted at at *VA.* 288, nor would it fit the case.

[2] *VA.* 289, "There was no offence for Dhaniya, because it was a first offence."

gone up to the hut they destroyed it. Then the venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son, said to these monks:

"Why, reverend sirs, do you destroy my hut?"

"Reverend sir, the lord causes it to be demolished," they said.

"Destroy it, reverend sirs, if the lord of dhamma[1] causes it to be destroyed," he said. ||2||

Then the venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son, thought: "For the third time when I have gone into the village for alms, women, gathering grass, gathering firewood, demolished the grass-hut, went away taking the grass and wood; and now this hut made by me and consisting of nothing but mud has been caused to be demolished by the lord. Now the overseer in the wood-yard is a friend of mine. What now, if I, having begged the overseer in a wood-yard for some sticks, were to make a wood hut?" Then the venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son, went up to the overseer in the wood-yard, and having gone up, he spoke thus to the overseer in the wood-yard:

"For the third time, your reverence, when I had gone into the village for alms, women, gathering grass, gathering firewood . . . has been caused to be destroyed by the lord. Give me some sticks, your reverence, I want to make a wood hut."

"There are no such sticks, honoured sir, that I could give the master. [42] These, honoured sir, are sticks held for the king, serving to repair the city, laid down in case of accident. If the king has those dealt out, you might take them, honoured sir," he said.

"Your reverence, they are gifts from the king."

Then the overseer of the wood-yard thought: "These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are followers of dhamma, followers of tranquillity, followers of the Brahma-life, speakers of truth, virtuous, of good conduct. Now the king has faith in these. It is not right[2] for what is said to be given not to be given." Then the overseer of the wood-yard spoke thus to the venerable Dhaniya,

---

[1] *dhammasāmi*, *cf. S.* iv. 94; *A.* v. 226.

[2] *na arahati.*

the potter's son: "You may take (some), honoured sir." Then the venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son, had these sticks broken up piece by piece and having them brought out by means of wagons, made a wood hut. || 3 ||

Now the brahmin Vassakāra,[1] the chief minister in Magadha, while he was inspecting the works in Rājagaha, came up to the overseer in the wood-yard, and having come up he spoke thus to the overseer in the wood-yard: "Look here, where are these sticks held for the king, serving to repair the city, laid down in case of accident?"

"Sir,[2] these sticks were given by the king to master Dhaniya, the potter's son," he said.

Then the brahmin Vassakāra, the chief minister in Magadha, was displeased: "How can the king give the sticks held for the king, serving to repair the city, laid down in case of accident, to Dhaniya, the potter's son?" he said.

Then the brahmin Vassakāra, the chief minister in Magadha, went up to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, and having come up he spoke thus to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha: "Is it true, as it is said, sire, that the sticks held for the king, serving to repair the city, laid down in case of accident, were given by the king to Dhaniya, the potter's son?"

"Who said that?"

"The overseer of the wood-yard, sire," he said.

"Then, brahmin, send for the overseer of the wood-yard," he said. Then Vassakāra, the chief minister of Magadha, had the overseer of the wood-yard fetched, bound. The venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son, saw the overseer of the wood-yard being brought along,

---

[1] At *Vin.* i. 228=*D.* ii. 86=*Ud.* 87 he and Sunidha, another chief minister, were building a fortified town at Pāṭaligāma against the Vajjins. At *D.* ii. 72 Ajātasattu, then King of Magadha, sent Vassakāra to tell Gotama that he (Ajāta°) was going to fight the Vajjins.

[2] *Sāmi.*

bound, and said to him: "Why are you brought bound, your reverence?"

"Because of this business with the pieces of wood, honoured sir," he said.

"Go, your reverence, for I come," he said.

"You should come with me, honoured sir, before I am done for," he said. ‖ 4 ‖

Then the venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son, approached the dwelling of King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, and having approached it he sat down on the appointed seat. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha came up to the venerable Dhaniya, [**43**] the potter's son, and having come up and greeted the venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son, he sat down to one side; and sitting to one side, King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha spoke thus to the venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son:

"Is it true, as is said, honoured sir, that the pieces of wood held for the king, serving to repair the city, laid down in case of need, have been given by me to the master?"

"It is so, your majesty," he said.

"We kings are very busy, honoured sir, with much to do; having given, we may not remember. Come, honoured sir, remind me."

"Do you remember, your majesty, when you were first anointed, this phrase was uttered: 'Let the recluses and brahmins enjoy gifts of grass, wood and water?'"

"I remember, honoured sir. There are, honoured sir, recluses and brahmins who are modest, scrupulous, anxious for training; there is only a little worry with these. What was uttered by me was meant[1] for these, and that was: what was in the jungle not owned.[2] So you, honoured sir, think to steal wood not given (to you) by this trick? How could one like me flog or

[1] *Tesaṃ mayā sandhāya bhāsitaṃ. Sandhāya* of text altered to *saddhāya* at *Vin.* v. 260. *VA.* 295 reads *sandh°*.

[2] *VA.* 295 says: "that grass, wood, and water not owned in the jungle, this is the meaning intended by me."

imprison or banish a recluse or a brahmin living in the kingdom? Go, honoured sir, you are freed on account of your hair,[1] but do not do such a thing again." ‖ 5 ‖

People became annoyed, vexed and angry, saying: "These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are shameless, of bad conduct, liars. And they pretend to be followers of dhamma, followers of tranquillity, followers of the Brahma-life, speakers of truth, those who are virtuous, of good conduct. There is no recluseship among these, there is no brahmanhood among these; recluseship is lost among these, brahmanhood is lost among these. Where is recluseship among these? Where is brahmanhood among these? These have destroyed recluseship, these have destroyed brahmanhood. If these deceive the king, how much more then do other people?"

Monks heard these people who were annoyed, vexed and angry. Those who were modest, happy monks, conscientious, scrupulous, anxious for training, became annoyed, vexed, angry and said: "How can the venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son, take pieces of wood belonging to the king when they have not been given (to him)?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. And the lord, on that occasion, in this connection, having the company of monks convened, questioned the venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son, saying:

"Is it true, as is said, Dhaniya, that you have taken pieces of wood belonging to the king when they were not given (to you)?"

"It is true, lord."

---

[1] *Lomena*. *VA*. 295 says that *loma* is the characteristic mark of *pabbajjā*. It is like the case of some evil-minded people, who wanting to eat flesh, take a goat with a fine coat. A clever man comes along and thinks that the goat's coat is valuable, so giving the other people two goats, he himself takes the valuable one. Thus this goat is freed on account of its coat or hair (*lomena*). Similarly, although the man who has done the deed (referred to in the text) is worthy of flogging or binding, yet because he bears the mark of an arahan (*arahaddhaja*) he is scatheless. Therefore, on account of his hair (*lomena*, *i.e.*, the down on the limbs) which is the sign of his having gone forth, he is freed, like the valuable goat.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying: "It is not fit, foolish man, it is not seemly, it is not becoming, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not proper, it is not to be done. How can you, [44] foolish man, take the pieces of wood belonging to the king when they have not been given to you? Foolish man, it is not for the benefit of non-believers,[1] not for increase in the number of believers, it is to the detriment of non-believers as well as of believers, and it causes wavering in some."

Now at that time a certain former minister of justice who had gone forth among the monks, was sitting near the lord. And the lord spoke thus to this monk:

"For what amount (of theft) does King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, having caught a robber, flog or imprison or banish him?"

"For a *pāda*,[2] lord, or for the worth of a *pāda*,[3] or for more than a *pāda*," he said.

Now at that time in Rājagaha the *pāda* was (worth)

---

[1] *A*. i. 98. At *G.S*. i. 84 *appasannānaṃ* is trans. "to believers" in error. It is, of course, "to non-believers or unbelievers."

[2] On *pāda* see Rhys Davids, *Ancient Coins*, etc., p. 2 f., where he says "there is nothing to prove that it meant a coin at all; it may have been a weight . . . recognised as a basis of calculation or a medium of exchange." *VA*. 297 says, "then in Rājagaha a kahāpaṇa was (worth) twenty māsakas, therefore a pāda was (worth) five māsakas, and a pāda, because of this property, is to be called a quarter of a kahāpaṇa throughout the countryside." At *Vin*. iii. 238, 240, kahāpaṇa appears in definition of *rajata* (silver), *rūpiya* (silver), respectively, but I think that it need not necessarily *mean* silver literally, as the copper, wood and lac māsakas also appear in these definitions of *rajata* and *rūpiya*. See p. 72, n. for *māsaka*. At *VvA*. 77=*DhA*. iii. 108 we get a descending line, *kahāpaṇa*, *aḍḍhapāda*, *māsaka*, then *kākaṇikā*. For this last see Rhys Davids, *Ancient Coins*, etc., p. 10. Owing to the uncertainty as to the exact nature of the coins: kahāpaṇa, māsaka, pāda, if indeed they were coins at all, I think it better to leave them untranslated. All we can say is that the kahāpaṇa was the unit of exchange in Pali literature, and that the others were mediums of exchange of lesser value than the kahāpaṇa. To translate *kahāpaṇa* by "penny" and so on as does Burlingame in *Buddhist Legends*, ii. 333 f. brings us no nearer to the sense of the Pali.

[3] *pādârahaŋ*. Here we have what is possibly an early use of *arahaŋ*, when it simply meant "worth" or "value," and not even so much as a "worthy person," far less a saint or man perfected.

five *māsakas.*[1] Then the lord, blaming the venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son, in several ways for his difficulty in behaving himself . . . "Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

"Whatever monk should take by means of theft what has not been given to him, in such manner of taking as kings, catching a thief in the act of stealing, would flog him or imprison him or banish him, saying: 'You are a robber, you are foolish, you are wrong, you are a thief,'—even so a monk, taking what is not given him, is also one who is defeated, he is not in communion."

And thus this course of training for monks was made known by the lord. || 6 || **1** ||

Now at that time the group of six monks, going to the bleachers' ford and stealing a bundle of things that had been bleached, carried it off to the park and divided it. The monks spoke thus:

"You, your reverences, have great merit, for many robes have accrued to you."

"Where is there merit for us, your reverences? Now we, having gone to the bleachers' ford, stole a bundle of things that had been bleached."

"But surely, your reverences, a course of training was made known by the lord. How can you, your reverences, steal a bundle of things that had been bleached?"

"It is true, your reverences, that a course of training was made known by the lord; but it is for the village and not for the jungle."

"Surely, your reverences, it is just as much for that.

---

[1] *māsaka* from *māsa*, a bean of the phaseolus, see below, p. 83, n. Enough has been said to show that usually twenty māsakas were reckoned to make a kahāpaṇa. As mentioned in foregoing note the copper, wood and lac māsakas are included in a definition of *rajata* and *rūpiya*. See also *VA*. 689-690 which speaks of māsakas made of skin, bone, fruits or seeds of trees, and says that some māsakas have figures stamped upon them. This passage goes on to say that, together with silver and gold, the gold māsaka and the silver māsaka are four things to be given up (by monks). See Rhys Davids, *Ancient Coins*, etc., pp. 8, 14. *Cf. S.* i. 79.

It is not fit, it is not seemly, it is not becoming, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not right, it should not be done. How can you, your reverences, steal a bundle of things that had been bleached? Your reverences, it is not for the benefit of non-believers, nor for increase in the number of believers, it is to the detriment of non-believers as well as of believers, and it causes wavering in some."

And then these monks, having rebuked the group of six monks in various ways, [45] told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, for this reason, having the company of monks convened, questioned the group of six monks:

"Is it true, as they say, monks, that you, having gone to the bleachers' ford, stole a bundle of things that had been bleached?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "It is not fit, foolish men, it is not seemly, it is not becoming, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not right, it should not be done. How can you, foolish men, going to the bleachers' ford, steal a bundle of things that had been bleached? Foolish men, it is not for the benefit of non-believers . . . in some." Then the lord rebuking the group of six monks for their difficulty in behaving themselves . . . praising the putting forth of energy, giving dhamma-talk on what was right and on what was seemly, said to the monks . . . "Thus this course of training, monks, should be set forth:

"Whatever monk should by means of theft take from a village or from the jungle what has not been given to him in such manner of taking as kings, catching a thief in the act of stealing, would flog him or imprison him or banish him, saying, 'You are a robber, you are foolish, you are wrong, you are a thief,'—even so a monk, taking what is not given him, is also one who is defeated, he is not in communion." || 2 ||

Whatever means he who . . . *Monk* . . . is monk to be understood in this meaning.

Village means: a village of one hut, and a village of two huts, and a village of three huts, and a village of four huts, and a village with human beings,[1] and a village with beings who are not human,[1] and a fenced-in village, and a village which is not fenced in; and a village arranged fortuitously, and even a caravan that is camping for more than four months is called a village. *The precincts of the village* means: of a fenced-in village, the outward stone-throw of a man of average height standing at the threshold; of a village not fenced in, the outward stone-throw of a man of average height standing at the precincts of a house.[2]

The *jungle* means: leaving aside the village and the outskirts of the village, what remains is called the jungle.[3]

What has not been given means: what has not been given, nor granted, nor thrown away; what is guarded, protected, cherished, what belongs to others—this is called what has not been given.

By means of theft means: intending to steal, intending to thieve.

Should take means: should take, should steal, should thieve, should interrupt the mode of movement, should remove from a place, should wait at a rendezvous.[4]

In such manner of taking as means: a *pāda*, the worth of a *pāda*, or more than a *pāda*. [46]

Kings mean: kings of the earth, local kings, kings' deputies, subordinate chieftains, judges, chief ministers; moreover those who administer torture and maiming are called kings.

---

[1] *samanusso pi gāmo amanusso pi gāmo*, or "a village that is inhabited or a village that is uninhabited." See n. 2, p. 147 below.

[2] See *Vism.* 71 f., which goes into the question of fixing the village precincts at greater length. It adduces Vinaya evidence: a stone thrown by young men in a display or strength fixes the boundary. The standard throw decides this. The *Vism.* goes on to say that the Suttanta scholars say that the boundary is the fall of a stone thrown to drive away a crow.

[3] Quoted at *SnA.* 83; and at *Vism.* 73. Here Vibhaṅga definition is also collected: "it is jungle when one goes out by the gate-pillars," *Vbh.* 251. Suttanta views as to relation of jungle and village are also given at *Vism.* 73.

[4] *saṃketa*, see below Pār. II. **4**. 30.

A *thief* means: he who takes by means of theft (anything) having the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas* that has not been given—he is called a thief.

Would flog means: they would flog with the hand, or the foot, or a whip, or a cane, or a rod, or with maiming.

Would imprison means: they would imprison with a binding of rope, with a binding of fetters, with a binding of chains, with a binding of a house, with a binding of a town, with a binding of a village, with a binding of a small town, or they would make a guard of men.

Would banish means: they would banish from the village or small town or town, or province or rural district.

You are a robber, you are foolish, you are wrong, you are a thief means: this is censure.

Even so means: a *pāda* or the worth of a *pāda* or more than a *pāda*.

Taking means: taking, stealing, thieving, interrupting the mode of movement, moving from a place, waiting at a rendezvous.

Also means: it is called so, in reference to the first.

One who is defeated means: as a withered leaf freed from its hold could not become[1] green again, thus a monk, taking by means of theft, a *pāda* or the worth of a *pāda* or more than a *pāda* which had not been given to him, is not a recluse, is not a son of the Sakyans[2]; therefore he is called one who is defeated.

Not in communion means: *communion* is called one work, one rule, an equal training, this is called communion. He who is not together with this, is therefore called not in communion. || **3** ||

Being in the earth,[3] being on firm ground, being in

---

[1] *Abhabba.*

[2] *Cf. Vin.* i. 96, where it is said that a monk who has received the upasampadā ordination should abstain from taking what is not given him and from theft, even of a blade of grass.

[3] Where necessary these terms are commented upon in notes on the following paragraphs.

the air, being above ground, being in the water, being in a boat, being in a vehicle, carried as a burden, being in a park, being in a vihāra, being in a field, being on a property, being in a village, being in a jungle, water, tooth-cleaner, forest tree, goods in transit, deposit, customs frontier, a creature without feet, two-footed, four-footed, many-footed creatures, a spy, the keeper of entrusted wares, an arranged theft, the making of a rendezvous, the making of a sign. || 1 ||

Being in the earth means: the goods are put down into the earth, buried and covered. If he says: "I will take the goods which are in the earth," and intending to steal, either he seeks for a companion,[1] or he seeks for a hoe or a basket (or) goes (himself),[2] there is an

[1] *dutiya*, a second one, a mate or helper, a friend, associate or accomplice.

[2] There are two curious points in this passage: (1) he seeks for a hoe *or* a basket, not for both; (2) the construction *pariyesati gacchati*, the use of two indicatives together being uncommon. It is more usual to find an indicative following a gerund. Does this sentence mean that having been unable to find a willing friend he goes and seeks for the implements himself? Or that seeking a hoe or a basket he goes himself to do the theft? In the following paragraphs the reading is simpler: *dutiyaṃ vā pariyesati gacchati vā*, he seeks for a friend or he goes away (or goes himself). *VA*. 310 f. says that realising that the treasure is too heavy for one person alone, he goes and wakes a sleeping friend (*sahāya*), who may bring his own hoe. But if he has not one, the intending thief goes to another monk and says: "Give me a hoe, I want it for something," and he gives some excuse—a pācittiya offence. If he finds that the hoe has no handle, he goes away for this purpose, and cuts down and shapes a piece of dry wood. There is a dukkaṭa offence in all these undertakings, except in lying, which is a pācittiya, and in cutting reeds for a basket—also a pācittiya.

We thus get two possible interpretations for *gacchati*: (1) that the intending thief goes away to another monk; (2) that he goes away to make a handle for the hoe. But in commenting on *gacchati vā*, *VA*. 311 says, "he goes to the place where the treasure is, the friend sought, the hoe (sought), the basket (sought)." This seems to convey the idea that he goes himself. I have therefore translated it in this way.

VA. 312 mentions the names of eight dukkaṭa offences which are interesting. There are *pubbapayogadukkaṭa*, *sahapayogaduk°*, *anāmāsaduk°*, *durūpaciṇṇaduk°*, *vinayaduk°*, *ñātaduk°*, *ñattiduk°*, *paṭis-*

offence of wrong-doing.[1] [47] If he breaks a piece of wood or a slender tree[2] growing there . . . If he digs up the soil or removes it or lifts it up . . . If he lays hold of a large round pot, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes it quiver,[3] there is a grave offence.[4] If he removes it from the place,[5] there is an offence involving defeat. Making it enter his own bowl, he touches something worth five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas*, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes it quiver, there is a grave offence. If he either puts it into his own bowl,[6] or detaches a handful,[7] there is an offence involving defeat. If he touches the goods, intending to steal them, (and) puts on an article such as a chain,[8] or a string,[9] or an ornamental string of beads

---

savadukkaṭa, which seem to mean respectively: the offence of a previous action, of a present action, of touching something forbidden (so *Crit. Pali Dict.*), the offence of handling something wrongfully, an offence concerning discipline, an offence concerning relations, an offence concerning a resolution, concerning obedience.

[1] *Dukkaṭa*, explained at *VA*. 313 as *duṭṭhu kata*, badly, wrongly done; and transgressing being done is called *dukkaṭa*. This is not one of the worst transgressions.

[2] *Latā*, a slender creeper.

[3] *Phandāpeti*, *cf*. *M*. i. 404 *phandato phandāpayato*, trans. at *Fur. Dial*. i. 291, "who sets folk quaking or causes another to do so." The meaning probably is that he takes hold of the article so that it throbs, trembles or shakes—a worse offence than merely laying hold of it, but not so bad as removing it.

[4] *Thullaccaya*, an offence whose nature is grave, *VA*. 314.

[5] *Thānā cāveti*. *Cf*. *Sn*. 442 *mā maṃ ṭhānā acāvayi*, trans. *H.O.S*. vol. 37, "May he never beat me back," and *S.B.E*. vol. x., "that he may not drive me away from my place."

[6] *Attano bhājanagataṃ vā karoti*. *Cf*. below, p. 85. *Bhājanagataṃ* expl. at *VA*. 316 to mean *bhājane yeva hoti*, as *kumbhigataṃ* is *kumbhiyam*, fem. loc.

[7] *Muṭṭhiṃ chindati*, *i.e.*, of kahāpaṇas. *VA*. 316; which also says, *evam muṭṭhiṃ karonto muṭṭhiṃ chindati nāma*, making a fist so is called detaching a handful so that no kahāpaṇas come out between the fingers.

[8] *Suttārūḷhaṃ*. *VA*. 316, "putting on chains means, tying on chains, made of chains." *Cf*. *Vin*. ii. 106 where the group of six monks wore similar things.

[9] *Pāmaṅga*, at *Vin. Texts* iii. 69, "ear-drops." *VA*. 316, "made of gold, made of silver, made of chains, strings of pearls and so on." Otherwise Bu. of no help here. *Cf*. *VA*. 534.

for the throat, or an ornamental string hanging from the ear,[1] or an ornamental girdle,[2] or a cloak, or a turban, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If he makes it quiver, there is a grave offence. If, holding it by the top,[3] he raises it up, there is a grave offence. If he draws it out, levelling it,[4] there is a grave offence. If he releases (the goods) even (as much as) a hair's breadth from the rim of the bowl, there is an offence involving defeat. If, intending to steal, he drinks at one gulp[5] ghee or oil or honey or molasses[6] to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas*, there is an offence involving defeat. Inasmuch as he breaks or disperses or burns or renders useless, there is an offence of wrong-doing. || 2 ||

Being on firm ground[7] means: the goods are put down on the firm ground. If intending to steal and saying: "I will steal the goods which are on the firm ground," he either searches for a companion, or goes himself, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he touches them,

---

[1] *Kaṇṇasuttaka* at *Vin.* i. 286 seems to mean a clothes-line; but *cf. Vin.* ii. 143.

[2] *Kaṭisuttaka.* Not enumerated at *Vin.* ii. 136 where other special kinds of girdles are mentioned. The monks were forbidden to wear any of these things, *Vin.* ii. 107. The use of *kaṭisuttaka*, meaning a hip-string, is forbidden to the nuns at *Vin.* ii. 271.

[3] *koṭiyaṃ gahetvā=ākāsaṭṭhaṃ akaronto, VA.* 317.

[4] *ghaṃsanto nīharati*, which according to *VA.* 317 means that when a big pot is brim-full, drawing it out and levelling a chain (*pāmaṅga*) across the mouth of the big pot, if he draws the chain further than the mouth, so that he drags off whatever goods rise higher than the level of the top of the pot, there is a pārājika offence. But if, in pulling the chain, he does not pull over any goods, as he does not pull the chain beyond the rim, there is a thullaccaya offence. See above, p. 77 n., on *pāmaṅga*.

[5] *payoga*, an elastic term, meaning action, business, undertaking; *cf. Vin.* iii. 50 below, where it seems to mean occasion, occurrence, happening.

[6] These, with fresh butter, *navanīta*, constitute the five kinds of medicine, *cf.* below, *Vin.* iii. 251.

[7] *thalaṭṭhaṃ. Thala* is solid ground, firm ground, as opposed to water; dry ground—*i.e.*, high, raised or sloping as opposed to low ground; or a plateau as opposed to a low-lying place. *VA.* 322 explains by *bhūmitale vā pāsādapabbatatalādīsu vā.*

there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes them quiver, there is a grave offence. If he removes them from the place, there is an offence involving defeat. || 3||

Being in the air means: the goods going in the air.[1] A peacock or a francolin partridge[2] or a partridge or a quail[3] or a cloak[4] or a turban, or an ornament[5] or gold,[5] being broken, falls to the ground; and he says: "I will steal the goods which have been in the air." If, intending to steal, he either searches for a companion, or goes himself, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he interrupts their journey . . . If he touches them, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes them quiver, there is a grave offence. If he removes them from the place, there is an offence involving defeat. ||4 ||

Being above ground[6] means: the goods are found above ground.[7] They get stuck in a couch or chair, or on a

[1] *ākāsagataṃ*, *gataṃ* being an elastic termination of some fixed significance.

[2] *kapiñjara*, possibly with this meaning, *cf. Kvu.* 268 (*kapiñjala*) and *Jā.* vi. 538.

[3] *vaṭṭako, P.T.S. Dict.* says a "cart," *vaṭṭakā* being "quail."

[4] Blown by the force of the wind and extended on the ground, *VA*. 324.

[5] *hiraññaṃ vā suvaṇṇaṃ vā.* While people are putting on, *e.g.* a necklace or while a goldsmith is making a *salākā*, if it falls from the fastener, and the thief makes off with it, *VA*. 324. But for these two words, *hir°* and *suv°*, *cf.* above p. 28, n.

[6] *Vehāsaṭṭhaṃ.* There is usually little difference between *vehāsa* and *ākāsa*, which is part of the word explained in the preceding paragraph. Both usually mean "air" or "atmosphere." But it is clear in this context that some greater difference is intended. In this paragraph, beginning "Being above ground," the goods are shown to come into contact with something standing on or supported by the earth, and are not, as "in the air," freed, like a bird, from the earth's support. *Vehāsaṭṭhaṃ*, with *bhūmigataṃ*, occurs at *D.* i. 115, and is trans. at *Dial.* i. 147 "above the ground," which I follow, and at *Fur. Dial* ii. 94, "housed in treasury chambers." *DA.* i. 284=*MA.* iii. 420, says "completing terraces and turrets (*pāsādaniyyūhādāyo*) and putting (it there) is called 'above the ground.'"

[7] *vehāsagataṃ*.

bamboo peg for hanging up a robe,[1] or on a cord for hanging up a robe, or on a peg in the wall,[2] or on an "elephant-tusk"(peg),[3] or in a tree, even on the support for a begging-bowl.[4] If, intending to steal, he thinks: "I will steal the goods that are found above ground," he either searches for a companion, or goes himself, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he touches them, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes them quiver, there is a grave offence. If he removes them from the place, there is an offence involving defeat. || 5 || [48]

Being in the water means: the goods are put down in the water. Intending to steal, he thinks: "I will steal the goods which are in the water;" he either searches for a companion, or goes himself, there is an offence of wrong-doing. He either dives into (the water) or emerges from (it), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he touches (the goods), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he causes them to quiver, there is a grave offence. If he removes them from the place, there is an offence involving defeat. Intending to steal, he touches either a blue, red, or white lotus which is growing there,[5] or the sprout of a lotus, or a fish or a turtle to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas*, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he causes them to quiver, there is a grave offence. If he removes them from the place, there is an offence involving defeat. || 6 ||

A boat means: that by which one crosses.[6] *Being in a boat* means: the goods are put down in a boat.

---

[1] *cīvaravaṃsa*. This and the next, *cīvararajju*, are often found together in *Vinaya*; *cf. Vin.* i. 47 and 286 where these things were prescribed for the monks.

[2] *bhittikhīla*. *VA.* 327, something knocked against the wall, driven straight in, or something that was there originally.

[3] *nāgadanta*. *VA.* 327 says that this is curved.

[4] *VA.* 328, this may be a support on a tree or on a fence or on a stick.

[5] *tatthajātaka*, lit. born there.

[6] *VA.* 332, here meaning even a washerman's tub or a sheaf of bamboos.

Intending to steal, he thinks: "I will steal the goods which are put down in a boat"; he either searches for a companion, or goes (himself), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he touches them . . . involving defeat. Intending to steal, he says: "I will steal the boat," . . . or goes himself, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he touches it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes it quiver, there is a grave offence. If he loosens the moorings, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, having loosened the moorings, he touches it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes it quiver, there is a grave offence. If he makes it move up or down, or across (the river) even for as much as a hair's breadth, there is an offence involving defeat. || 7 ||

A vehicle[1] means: a litter, a two-wheeled carriage, a waggon, a chariot.[2] *Being in a vehicle* means: the goods are laid down in a vehicle. Intending to steal, he thinks: "I will steal the goods laid down in the vehicle," . . . or goes himself: there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he touches them . . . involving defeat. Intending to steal, he thinks: "I will steal the vehicle" . . . or goes himself, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he touches (it) . . . involving defeat. || 8 ||

A burden means: a burden carried on the head, a burden carried on the back (or shoulder), a burden carried on the hip and hanging down. Intending to steal, he touches the burden on the head, there is an

[1] *yāna*, a way, the act of going, so a vehicle. Earlier, in the Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads, it had meant a *way*, rather than the means of going, as *devayāna*, *pitṛyāna*, the way to the devas, the way to the ancestors. Dasgupta sees the word as "career," *History of Indian Philosophy I.* 125. This rendering was adopted by E. J. Thomas, *History of Buddhist Thought*, p. 178, in referring to later (Mahāyāna) teaching. The above definition clearly rules out "career" for this passage.

[2] *Cf. Vin.* iv. 339 where two more are added: *sivikā pāṭaṅkī*, palanquin and sedan-chair.

offence of wrong-doing. If he makes it quiver, there is a grave offence. If he robs the back (of its burden), there is an offence involving defeat. Intending to steal, he touches the burden on the back, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes it quiver, there is a grave offence. If he robs the hip, there is an offence involving defeat. Intending to steal, he touches the burden on the hip, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he causes it to quiver, there is a grave offence. If he takes it with his hands, there is an offence involving defeat. Intending to steal the burden with his hand, he deposits it on the ground, there is an offence involving defeat. Intending to steal, he takes it from the ground, there is an offence involving defeat. || 9 ||

A park means: a park with flowers, a park with fruit (*i.e.*, an orchard). *Being in a park* means: the goods are laid down in the park in four places: in the earth, on the firm ground, in the air, above the ground. [**49**] Intending to steal, he thinks: "I will steal the goods which are in the park," . . . or goes himself, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he touches them . . . involving defeat. Intending to steal, he touches a root growing there,[1] or a (piece of) bark,[2] or a leaf, or a flower,[3] or a fruit to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas* . . . involving defeat. If he claims the park,[4] there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he evokes doubt in the keeper (of the park), there is a grave offence. If the keeper, saying: "This will not be for me," gives up his post,[5] there is an offence involving defeat. Resorting to law[6] he defeats the keeper, there is an offence

[1] *tatthajātaka*, *cf.* p. 80, n. 5; *VA.* 337 f., applies this adjective only to *mūla*.

[2] bark was used for medicine or dye; to harm a tree with valuable bark was a pārājika, *VA.* 338. [3] such as jasmine and lotus.

[4] *VA.* 338, *i.e.* belonging to someone else, saying, 'It is mine'; in this attempt to take what is not given, there is a dukkaṭa.

[5] *dhuraṃ nikkhipati*, or "throws off his responsibility."

[6] *dhammaṃ caranto. VA.* ii. 339=*bhikkhusanghe vā rājakule vā vinicchayaṃ karonto;* but the judges having descended to false witnesses pervert justice and conquer the keeper.

involving defeat. Resorting to law,[1] he is defeated,[2] there is a grave offence. || 10 ||

Being in a vihāra[3] means: the goods are deposited in a vihāra in four places: in the earth, on the firm ground, in the air, above the ground. Intending to steal, he thinks: "I will steal the goods deposited in the vihāra," . . . or goes himself, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he touches . . . involving defeat. If he claims the vihāra . . . he is defeated[2]: there is a grave offence. || 11 ||

A *field* means: where grain and pulses[4] are produced. *Being in a field* means: the goods are deposited in a field in four places: in the earth, on the firm ground, in the air, above the ground. Intending to steal, he thinks: "I will steal the goods deposited in the field," . . . or goes himself, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he touches . . . offence involving defeat. Intending

[1] Here *VA*. 339 says, "but if proceeding with the investigation by means of Vinaya and dhamma and the master's teaching, he accomplishes his own defeat . . . he falls into a thullaccaya."

[2] *parajjati*.

[3] Note that this par, and || 14 || below do not begin by saying: "a vihāra means:", "a village means:", as do the others here.

[4] There are seven sorts of grain (*pubbaṇṇa*) and seven kinds of pulses or cereals (*aparaṇṇa*). *Nd*. ii. 314 distinguishes these two sorts of grain: *pubbaṇṇa* (natural) and *aparaṇṇa* (prepared). To the first, here called *dhañña*, belong *sāli* and *vīhi* (rice-sorts), *yava* (barley), *godhūma* (wheat), *kaṅga* (millet), *varaka* (beans), *kudrūsaka*. At *Dial*. iii. 70 n. 1 translator says *kudrūsaka* is a "kind of rye." At *D*. iii. 71 it is said that as now *sāli* and curry (*maṃsodana*) are the highest kinds of food, so when man's life-span is reduced to ten years, *kudrūsaka* will become the highest food. At *Vin*. iv. 264 these kinds of grain are catalogued under *āmaka-dhañña*, "raw" grain, corn in its natural, unprepared state. At *D*. i. 5=*A*. ii. 209 it is said that Gotama is one who abstains from accepting this *āmakadhañña*. *Nd*. i. 248, in defining *khetta* gives a rather different series of seven grains; *sāli, vīhi, mugga* (kidney-bean), *māsa* (a bean, Phaseolus indica or radiata), *yava, godhūma, tila* (sesame plant). *Miln*. 106 again varies slightly: *sāli, vīhi, yava, taṇḍula* (rice-grain), *tila, mugga, māsa*. *A*. iv. 108=112 includes *tila, mugga, māsa* under *aparaṇṇa*. A list of provisions for a journey at *Vin*. i. 244 includes *taṇḍula, mugga, māsa*. *Jā*. v. 106 says that *hareṇukâ ti aparaṇṇajâ ti*.

to steal, he touches either the grain which grows there or the pulses to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas*, there is an offence involving defeat. If he claims the field . . . he is defeated, there is a grave offence. If he shifts the post, or the cord, or the fence, or the boundary, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Before he has finally done this, there is a grave offence; when he has finally done this, there is an offence involving defeat.[1] || 12 ||

A property means: the property of a park, the property of a vihāra. *Being on a property* means: the goods are deposited on a property in four places: in the earth, on the firm ground, in the air, above the ground. Intending to steal, he thinks: "I will steal the goods which are on the property," . . . or he goes himself, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he touches . . . involving defeat. If he claims the property . . . he is defeated, there is a grave offence. If he shifts the post, or the cord, or the fence, or the boundary, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Before he has finally done this, there is a grave offence; when he has finally done this, there is an offence involving defeat. || 13 ||

Being in a village means: the goods are deposited in a village in four places: in the earth, on the firm ground, in the air, above the ground. Intending to steal, he thinks: "I will steal the goods which are in the village," . . . or he goes himself, there is an offence

---

[1] *Ekaṃ payogaṃ anāgate, āpatti thullaccayassa ; tasmin payoge āgate, āpatti pārājikassa.* Note the use of acc. and loc. *VA.* 341 says, "desiring to make a field for himself using the enclosure of another person's field, he digs in the wood. Each time he uses a piece, there is a dukkaṭa offence (*payoge payoge dukkaṭaṃ*); when one piece is still to come, there is a thullaccaya offence (*ekasmiṃ anāgate thullaccayaṃ*); when that piece has come, there is a pārājika (*tasmiṃ āgate pārājikaṃ*)." *Comy.* goes on to say that if by these means one is able to enclose a field for himself, then there is a dukkaṭa with the first *payoga*, and finally (*avasāne*) there is one of two things: a thullaccaya according to one, a pārājika according to the other.

of wrong-doing. If he touches them, there is an offence involving defeat. || 14 || [50]

The jungle means: that which is taken for (the use) of men, that is the jungle. *Being in the jungle* means: the goods are deposited in the jungle in four places: in the earth, on the firm ground, in the air, above the ground. Intending to steal, he thinks: "I will steal the goods which are in the earth," . . . or he has access to them, there is an offence of wrong-doing. He touches them . . . involving defeat. Intending to steal, he touches a piece of wood growing there, or a creeper, or grass to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas* . . . there is an offence involving defeat. || 15 ||

Water means: either it has gone into a bowl or into a pond or into a reservoir. Intending to steal, he touches it . . . there is an offence involving defeat. Having put water to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas* into his own bowl, he touches it, intending to steal it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes it quiver, there is a grave offence. If he puts it into his own bowl,[1] there is an offence involving defeat. If he breaks the embankment, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Having broken the embankment he empties water to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas*, there is an offence involving defeat. He empties water to the value of more than a *māsaka* or of four *māsakas*, there is a grave offence. He empties water to the value of a *māsaka* or less than a *māsaka*, there is an offence of wrong-doing. || 16 ||

Tooth-cleaner means: either broken or unbroken. Intending to steal, he touches one of the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas*, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes it quiver, there is a grave offence. If he removes it from the place, there is an offence involving defeat. || 17 ||

---

[1] *attano bhājanagataṃ karoti, cf.* above, p. 77.

Forest tree[1] means: what is taken for (the use of) men, a useful tree. Intending to steal, he fells it, for each blow there is an offence of wrong-doing. With one still to come, there is a grave offence; when that blow has come, there is an offence involving defeat.[2] || 18 ||

Goods in transit[3] means: the goods in transit belonging to another. Intending to steal, he touches them . . . involving defeat. Thinking: "I will take the carrier together with the goods," he moves the first foot, there is a grave offence; he moves the second foot, there is an offence involving defeat. Thinking: "I will seize the fallen goods," he makes them fall, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Intending to steal, he touches the fallen goods to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas* . . . involving defeat. || 19 ||

Deposit means: goods laid down (reserved). "Give me the goods," he says; if one calls out to him: "I am not taking them," there is an offence of wrong-doing. He evokes doubt in (the mind of) the keeper, there is a grave offence. [51] The keeper, saying: "He will not give it to me," gives up his post, there is an offence involving defeat. Resorting to law he defeats the keeper, there is an offence involving defeat. Resorting to law he is defeated, there is a grave offence.[4] || 20 ||

Customs-frontier means: it is established by the king in a mountain-pass, or at a ford in a river, or at the gate of a village, so that tax shall be received on a person entering here. Intending to steal, and having entered there, he touches goods which are of value to the king to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas*, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes them quiver, there is a grave offence. If he makes his first foot cross the customs-frontier, there is a grave offence.

[1] *VA*. 347, "the oldest tree, but here (*idha*) all are taken for the use of people."
[2] *Cf.* above, pars. 12, 14.
[3] *haraṇaka*, from √*hṛ*, to bring, convey, carry, fetch.
[4] *Cf.* above, II. 4, 10.

If he makes his second foot cross the customs-frontier, there is an offence involving defeat. Standing within the customs-frontier, he makes them fall outside the customs-frontier, there is an offence involving defeat. If he evades the tax, there is an offence of wrong-doing. || 21 ||

Creature means: what is called a human creature. Intending to steal, he touches it . . . there is an offence involving defeat. Thinking: "I will conduct (him) on foot," he makes the first foot move, there is a grave offence. If he makes the second foot move, there is an offence involving defeat. || 22 ||

Footless means: snakes and fish. Intending to steal, he touches them to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas* . . . involving defeat. || 23 ||

Two-footed[1] means: men and birds. Intending to steal, he touches them . . . involving defeat. Saying: "I will lead them away on foot," he makes the first foot move, there is a grave offence. If he makes the second foot move, there is an offence involving defeat. || 24 ||

Four-footed means: elephants, horses, camels,[2] bullocks, asses, cattle. Intending to steal, he touches them . . . there is an offence involving defeat. Saying: "I will

---

[1] *VA*. 363 says there are three kinds of creatures born with wings: those with wings of down (*loma*), such as peacocks and partridges; those with wings of skin, such as bats; those with wings of bone, such as bees.

[2] *oṭṭha*, "camel" in Class. Sanskrit. This word appears in another list of animals at *Miln*. 32, there translated "camels." Morris, *J.P.T.S.* 1887, p. 150, for *oṭṭhivyādhi* suggests "female elephant," a rendering followed by Francis and Neil in translating *Jā*. iii. 385. Here the *oṭṭhivyādhi* is made to speak of feats done by her in battle with words which, however, ring equally true if they came from a camel. *Oṭṭha* can hardly mean "elephant" here, since the ordinary word *hatthi* is included in the list. Monier Williams, *Sanskrit Dictionary*, Oxford, 1872, has "uṣṭra . . . a buffalo; a bull with a hump; a camel; a cart, a waggon; . . . (ī), f. a she-camel; an earthen vessel in the shape of a camel."

lead them away on foot," he makes the first foot move, there is a grave offence. If he makes the second foot move, there is a grave offence. If he makes the third foot move, there is a grave offence. If he makes the fourth foot move, there is an offence involving defeat. || 25 ||

Many-footed means: scorpions, centipedes, live maw-worms.[1] Intending to steal, he touches them to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas* . . . there is an offence involving defeat. Saying: "I will lead them away on foot," he makes them move, for each foot there is a grave offence. If he makes the last foot move, there is an offence involving defeat. || 26 ||

A spy means: spying on the goods,[2] he describes them,[3] saying: "Do you steal such and such goods," there is an offence involving a double defeat.[4] || 27 || [52]

The keeper of entrusted wares means: guarding goods that have been brought (to him) to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas*, (and) intending to steal, he handles[5] (the goods) . . . involving defeat. || 28 ||

An arranged theft means: a crowd having arranged together[6] (to commit a theft), one steals the goods, all are involved in defeat. || 29 ||

The making of a rendezvous[7] means: he makes a rendezvous (for a time) either before or after a meal, or during the night or the day; according to this rendezvous, he says: "Do you steal," there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, at this rendezvous, he steals the goods, there

[1] *uccāliṅgapāṇakā*. *Comy.* gives no help.
[2] "examining them and considering them." *VA.* 365.
[3] *I.e.*, to another as goods put carelessly or unguarded in other houses or vihāras.
[4] *ubhinnaṃ pārājikassa*, for he both incites others and assists in the theft himself.
[5] "He puts them into a sack or a well." *VA.* 366.
[6] *saṃvidahitvā*, also below, Pār. II. 7, 34.
[7] *saṃketakamma*.

is an offence involving defeat for both. If he steals the goods before or after the (time of the) rendezvous, there is no offence for the instigator, there is an offence involving defeat for the thief. || 30 ||

The making of a sign means: he makes a sign, saying: "I will either cover up my eyes or I will raise my eyebrows or raise my head: according to this sign, do you steal the goods," there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, according to this sign, he steals the goods, there is an offence involving a double defeat. If he steals the goods before or after this sign, there is no offence for the instigator, there is an offence involving defeat for the thief. || 31 || **4** ||

If a monk enjoins a monk, saying: "Steal such and such goods," there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he, thinking these (are goods to be stolen), steals them, there is an offence involving defeat for both. If a monk enjoins a monk, saying: "Steal such and such goods," and he, thinking these (are the goods to be stolen), steals something else, there is no offence for the instigator, there is an offence involving defeat for the thief. If a monk . . . he, thinking something else (are the goods to be stolen), steals them, there is an offence involving defeat for both. If a monk . . . he, thinking something else (are the goods to be stolen), steals something else, there is no offence for the instigator; there is an offence involving defeat for the thief. || 1 ||

If a monk enjoins a monk, saying: "Tell of such and such (matter), let so and so tell of such and such, let so and so steal such and such goods," there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he speaks to another, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If the thief agrees, there is a grave offence for the instigator. If he steals these goods, there is an offence involving defeat for all (these four people).[1] If a monk enjoins a monk, saying: "Tell

[1] *VA.* 369, *sabbesaṃ catunnaṃ pi janānaṃ pārājikaṃ.*

of such and such (a matter) . . . let so and so steal such and such goods," there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he enjoins another, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If the thief agrees, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he steals these goods, there is no offence for the instigator, there is an offence involving defeat for the enjoiner and the thief. || 2 ||

If a monk enjoins a monk, [**53**] saying: "Steal such and such goods," there is an offence of wrong-doing. Having gone, he returns, saying: "I am not able to steal these goods," and if he enjoins him again, saying: "When you are able, then steal these goods," there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he steals the goods, there is an offence involving defeat for both. || 3 ||

If a monk enjoins a monk, saying: "Steal such and such goods," there is an offence of wrong-doing. If having enjoined (this course), he regrets it, but does not say[1] to him: "Do not steal," and he steals these goods, there is an offence involving defeat for both. If a monk . . . having enjoined (this course), regrets it, and says to him: "Do not steal," and he says: "Very well,"[2] and desists, there is no offence for either. || 4 || **5** ||

There is an offence involving defeat through appropriating in five ways what is not given: it is the possession of another, and known to be the possession of another, and it is important, and it is a requisite to the value of five or more *māsakas*, and there is present the intention to steal. If he touches it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes it quiver, there is a grave offence. If he removes it from the place, there is an offence involving defeat.

There is a grave offence through appropriating in five ways what is not given: it is the possession of another, and known to be the possession of another, and it is

[1] *na sāveti*, causative of *suṇāti*, to hear. [2] *suṭṭhu*.

unimportant, and it is a requisite to the value of more than a *māsaka* or less than five *māsakas*, and there is intention to steal what is at one's disposal. If he touches it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes it quiver, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he removes it from the place, there is a grave offence.

There is an offence of wrong-doing through appropriating in five ways what is not given: it is the property of another . . . a requisite to the value of a *māsaka* or less than a *māsaka*, and there is present the intention to steal. If he touches it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes it quiver, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he removes it from the place, there is an offence of wrong-doing. || 1 ||

There is an offence involving defeat through appropriating in six ways what is not given: he does not know it is his own, he does not take a confidant, it is not for the time being, it is important, it is a requisite to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas*, and there is present the intention to steal. If he touches it . . . involving defeat.

There is a grave offence through appropriating in six ways what is not given: he does not know it is his own . . . it is unimportant, it is a requisite [**54**] worth more than a *māsaka* or less than five *māsakas*, and there is intention to steal . . . there is a grave offence.

There is an offence of wrong-doing through appropriating in six ways what is not given: he does not know it is not his own . . . it is unimportant, it is a requisite to the value of a *māsaka* or less than a *māsaka*, and there is intention to steal . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing. || 2 ||

There is an offence of wrong-doing through appropriating in five ways what is not given: it is not the possession of another, he thinks it is the possession of another, it is important . . . to the value of more than five *māsakas*, there is present the intention to steal. If he touches it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If

he makes it quiver, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he removes it from the place, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is an offence of wrong-doing through appropriating in five ways what is not given: it is not the possession of another, he thinks it is the possession of another, it is unimportant . . . to the value of less than five *māsakas*, there is present the intention to steal. If he touches it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes it quiver, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he removes it from its place, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is an offence of wrong-doing through appropriating in five ways what is not given: it is not the property of another, he thinks it is the property of another, it is unimportant . . . to the value of less than a *māsaka*, and there is present the intention to steal. If he touches it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes it quiver, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he removes it from its place, there is an offence of wrong-doing. || 3 ||

There is no offence if he knows it is his own, if he is taken as a confidant, if it is taken temporarily,[1] if he is in the realm of the departed,[2] if he is in the animal-world, if he thinks them to be rags taken from the dust-heap,[3]

---

[1] *I.e.*, with intention to give it back; *VA*. 372, *paṭidassāmi paṭikarissāmi*; *cf*. *Vin*. iii. 66=ii. 174, where the lord is represented as allowing monks to take away temporarily.

[2] *petapariggahe=pittivisaye*, *VA*. 372, the realm or world of the departed. Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Indian Religion and Survival* (London, 1934), p. 35, says *peta*, " a word which, meaning literally ' gone before,' is held to be a corruption of the older term *pitṛ*-, or fathers'-world." *VA*. 372 says, " having done his time in the world of the departed where he had arisen and being reborn in that existence, all the devas of the retinue of the Four Firmament Devas go to destruction as departed ones: for these there is no guilt in that realm."

[3] *VA*. 373. If he knows that these rags have no owner (*assāmika*) there is no offence in taking them; but if they have an owner, he should give them to him, having had them fetched.

if he is mad, if his mind is unhinged, if he is afflicted by pain, if he is a beginner.[1] ||4||6||

Told is the First Recital on Taking what is not Given.

Five things told about bleachers, and four about outer coverings,
Five indeed about darkness,[2] and five about carrying,/
Five things told about the way of expressing oneself, the next two about the wind,
The not decomposed, the casting of a Kusa lot,[3] in the bathroom[4] is the tenth,/
Five things told about broken meats, and five about inexistent receivers,
And Kuru-meat in famine, cakes and sweetmeats,/
The bag for carrying the set of necessaries, bolster, a bamboo-peg, on not coming out,
And trust about foodstuffs, the next two about knowing one's own,/
Seven times saying "We do not steal," seven times they did steal,
Seven times they stole from the Order; the next two on flowers,/
Three on taking greetings,[5] three jewels are taken past,
And pigs, deer, fish, and even he set going the vehicle,/
Two on a piece of flesh, two on sticks, rags taken from the dust-heap, two on water, [55]
Little by little, having made arrangement, it did not amount (to five *māsakas*),/
Four handfuls at Sāvatthī, two on broken-meats, two about grass,

[1] Bu. says (*VA*. 373) that Dhaniya was the beginner, and there was no offence for him.

[2] *Andhakāra.*

[3] A blade (or blades) of the Kusa grass cast to give the proper distribution of robes. *VA*. 378.

[4] Text here reads *jantagghena*, but at *Vin*. iii. 58, where the story is given we get *jantāghare.*

[5] *Vuttavādino.*

Seven on distribution for the Order, seven on being not owners, /
Wood, water, clay, two on grass, he stole seven times intentionally from the Order,
One should not take away what has an owner, one may take for the time being what has an owner, /
At Campā and in Rājagaha, and Ajjuka at Vesālī,
And Benares, and Kosambī, Sāgalā and about Dalhika.

At one time the group of six monks having gone to the (things) spread out to be bleached, stole a bleacher's bundle. They were remorseful, and said: "The course of training has been made known by the lord. Let us hope that we have not fallen into an offence involving defeat."[1] . . . They told this matter to the lord. . . . "You, monks, have fallen into an offence involving defeat." || 1 ||

At one time a certain monk having gone to the (things) spread out to be bleached, and seeing a garment of very great worth, had the intention to steal it. On account of this he was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence, monk, because it was a passing thought."

At one time a certain monk . . . seeing a garment of very great worth, intending to steal it, touched it. On account of this he was remorseful. . . . "Monk, there is no offence involving defeat, there is an offence of wrong-doing."

At one time a certain monk . . . made it quiver. On this account he was remorseful. . . . "There is a grave offence."

At one time there was a certain monk . . . removed it from its place. On account of this he was remorseful. . . . "You, monk, have fallen into an offence involving defeat." || 2 ||

At one time a certain monk who was going for alms

[1] *Cf.* I. **10**, 1.

saw a valuable outer cover[1] and had the intention to steal it . . . intending to steal it, he touched it . . . intending to steal it, he made it quiver . . . intending to steal it, he removed it from the place. On account of this he was remorseful. . . . "You, monk, have fallen into an offence involving defeat." || 3 ||

At one time a certain monk, seeing some goods during the day, made a sign, saying: "I will steal (these) at night." Thinking of them he stole them . . . thinking of them, he stole something else . . . thinking others to be the ones, he stole these[2] . . . thinking others to be the ones, he stole those others. On account of this he was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat." [56]

At one time a certain monk, seeing some goods during the day, made a sign, saying: "I will steal (these) at night." Thinking others to be the ones, he stole his own goods. On account of this he was remorseful. . . . "Monk, there is no offence involving defeat, there is an offence of wrong-doing." || 4 ||

At one time a certain monk carrying the goods of another, touched the burden, intending to steal it, on the head . . . intending to steal it, he made it quiver . . . intending to steal it, he lifted it on to his shoulder . . . intending to steal it, he touched the burden on the shoulder . . . intending to steal it, he moved it . . . intending to steal it, he lifted it on to his hip . . . intending to steal it, he touched the hip-burden . . . intending to steal it, he moved it . . . intending to steal it, he took hold of it with his hands . . . intending to steal the burden in his hands, he deposited it on the ground. On account of this he was remorseful. . . . "You, monk, have fallen into an offence involving defeat." || 5 ||

At one time a certain monk having spread out his robe in the open air, entered the vihāra. A certain

[1] *uttarattharaṇa.*

[2] which he had originally thought of stealing.

monk, saying: "Do not let this robe be lost," put it aside. Having come out (of the vihāra), he[1] asked the monks: "Your reverences, who has stolen my robe?" He[2] said: "I have stolen it." He[1] seized him and said: "You are not a (true) recluse." Thereupon he[2] was remorseful. He told this matter to the lord. He said: "Of what were you thinking, monk?"

"I, lord? It was a way of speaking," he said.

(The lord) said: "There is no offence, monk, in the way of speaking."[3]

At one time, a certain monk, putting down his robe on a chair . . . his mat on a chair . . . putting down his bowl under the chair, entered the vihāra. A certain monk, saying: "Do not let the bowl be lost," put it aside. Having come out, he[1] asked the monks: "Your reverences, who has stolen my bowl?" He[2] said: "I have stolen it." He[1] seized him . . . "your way of speaking."

At one time a certain nun, having spread out her robe on a fence, entered the vihāra. A certain nun, saying: "Do not let this robe be lost," put it aside. Having come out, she[4] asked the nuns: "Ladies,[5] who has stolen my robe?" She[6] said: "I have stolen it." She[4] seized her and said: "You are not a (true) woman recluse." On account of this she[6] was remorseful. This nun told this matter to the nuns. The nuns told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the lord. . . . "There is no offence, monks, because of her way of speaking." || 6 || [57]

At that time a certain monk seeing a cloak blown up during a whirlwind, took hold of it, saying: "I will give it to the owners." The owners reprimanded the monk, saying: "You are not a (true) recluse." On account of this he was remorseful. . . . "Of what were you thinking, monk?"

---

[1] The first monk. [2] The second monk.

[3] *āpatti* here followed by loc. instead of gen.

[4] The first nun. [5] *ayye.* [6] The second nun.

"I did not intend to steal it, lord," he said.

"Monk, there is no offence as you did not intend to steal."

At one time a certain monk intending to steal, laid hold of a turban which had been blown into the air during a whirlwind, "before the owners see." The owners reprimanded the monk, saying: "You are not a (true) recluse." Because of this he was remorseful. . . . "You, monk, have fallen into an offence involving defeat." || 7 ||

At one time a certain monk going to the cemetery took hold of rags taken from the dust-heap which were on a body not (yet) decomposed. And the departed one[1] was dwelling in this body.[2] Then the departed one said to the monk: "Honoured sir, do not take hold of my cloak." The monk, unheeding, went away. Then the body, arising,[3] followed closely on the heels of the monk. Then the monk, entering the vihāra, closed the door. Then the body fell down at that very place.[4] On account of this he was remorseful. . . . "Monk, there is no offence involving defeat. (But) a monk should not take rags from the dust-heap (which are) on a body not (yet) decomposed.[5] Whoever should take them: this is an offence of wrong-doing." || 8 ||

At one time a certain monk at the distribution of robes to the Order, casting the kusa-grass and intending to steal, took hold of a robe. On account of this he was remorseful . . . "involving defeat." || 9 ||

At one time the venerable Ānanda, thinking that the inner garment of another monk was his own, robed

[1] *peta.* See above, p. 92, n.
[2] "On account of its longing for a cloak," *VA*. 374—*i.e.*, probably naked and needing a cloak.
[3] Through the *peta's* own power, *VA*. 374.
[4] At the closed door the *peta*, being devoid of desire for the cloak, left the body, and went according to its deed, *VA*. 374.
[5] Still warm. *VA*. 374.

himself in the bath-room.[1] Then this monk said to the venerable Ānanda: "Why did you, reverend Ānanda, robe yourself in my inner garment?"

"Your reverence, I thought it was my own," he said.

They told this matter to the lord. He said: "There is no offence, monks, as he thought it was his own." || 10 ||

At one time a company of monks, descending from the slopes of the Vulture's Peak, seeing the remains of a lion's kill, had it cooked and ate it. Because of this they were remorseful. . . . "Monks, there is no offence in (this matter of) the remains of a lion's kill."[2]

At one time a company of monks, descending from the slopes of the Vulture's Peak, seeing the remains of a tiger's kill . . . seeing the remains of a panther's kill . . . seeing the remains of a hyena's kill . . . seeing the remains of a wolf's kill, had it cooked . . . "Monks, there is no offence in taking what belongs to animals." || 11 || [58]

At one time a certain monk, gruel being distributed to the Order, said to another: "Give me a portion for another," and he took for an inexistent (monk).[3] For this he was remorseful. . . . "Monk, there is no offence involving defeat, there is an offence involving expiation[4] for deliberately lying."[5]

At one time a certain monk, hard foods being distributed to the Order . . . cakes . . . sugar-cane . . . (a species of cucumber) being distributed to the Order said to another: "Give (me) a portion for another," and he took for an inexistent (monk).[3] On account of this he

[1] *jantāghara.*

[2] This shows that vegetarianism was not (at this time) enjoined; *cf.* below, pp. 297, 298.

[3] *amūlaka.*

[4] *Pācittiya,* discussed in forthcoming vol.

[5] He must therefore have eaten it himself, the "for another" being only an excuse.

was remorseful. . . . "Monk, there is no offence involving defeat, there is offence involving expiation for deliberately lying."[1] || 12 ||

At one time a certain monk, entering a rice kitchen[2] during a shortage of alms-food, intending to steal, stole a bowlful of rice. On account of this he was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat."

At one time a certain monk, entering a slaughter-house during a shortage of alms-food, intending to steal, stole a bowlful of meat.[3] . . . ". . . defeat."

At one time a certain monk, entering a bakery during a shortage of alms-food, intending to steal, stole a bowlful of baked cakes . . . intending to steal, stole a bowlful of cake . . . intending to steal, stole a bowlful of sweetmeats. On account of this he was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat." || 13 ||

At one time a certain monk, seeing a set of requisites during the day, made a sign, saying: "I will steal it at night." Thinking this to be the one, he stole it . . . thinking another to be the one, he stole that (which he had originally thought of stealing) . . . thinking another to be the one, he stole this other. On account of this he was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat."

At one time a certain monk, seeing a set of requisites during the day, made a sign, saying: "I will steal it at night." Thinking another to be the one (which he had thought of stealing), he stole his own set of requisites. On account of this he was remorseful. . . . "Monk, there is no offence involving defeat, there is an offence of wrong-doing." || 14 ||

At one time a certain monk, seeing a bag put by on a seat, and saying: "If I take it from here I shall become one who is defeated," he took hold of it, moving

---

[1] He must therefore have eaten it himself, the "for another" being only an excuse.

[2] *odaniyaghara.*

[3] Again the fault is not in eating meat, it is in stealing.

it together with the seat. On account of this he was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat." || 15 ||

At one time a certain monk, intending to steal, stole a bolster belonging to the Order. On account of this he was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat." || 16 ||

At one time a certain monk, [59] intending to steal, stole a robe from the bamboo[1] used for hanging up the robes. On account of this he was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat." || 17 ||

At one time a certain monk, stealing a robe in the vihāra, and saying: "Coming out from here I shall become one who is defeated," he did not go out from the vihāra. They told this matter to the lord. He said: "Whether he comes out, monks, or whether the foolish man does not come out, there is an offence involving defeat." || 18 ||

At one time two monks were companions. One monk went into the village for alms. The other monk, taking his friend's portion of the hard foods distributed to the Order, putting his trust in him, ate it. (But) as he[2] knew this, he reprimanded him, saying: "You are not a (true) recluse." On account of this he was remorseful. . . .

"Monk, of what were you thinking?"

"I had a misconception as to the trust, lord," he said.

"There is no offence, monk, because there was a misconception as to the trust." || 19 ||

At one time a company of monks was making robes. As the hard food was distributed to the Order, the portions[3] brought to them were laid aside.[4] A certain monk,

[1] Here *cīvaravaṃsa* is not in conjunction with *cīvararajju*, the cord or rope for hanging the robes on.

[2] The first monk.

[3] *paṭivisa*.

[4] *Upanikkhittā honti. Upanikkhitta* is the participle of the perfect passive of *upanikkhipati*.

thinking that it was his own, ate the portion[1] of another monk. He, knowing this, reprimanded him, saying: "You are not a (true) recluse." On account of this he was remorseful. . . . ". . . Monk, are you out of your senses?"

"I thought it was my own, lord," he said.

"There is no offence, monk, as you thought it was your own," he said.

At one time a company of monks was making robes. When a certain monk had taken with his bowl another monk's share[1] of the Order's hard and soft foods, it was laid aside. The monk who was the owner of the bowl ate (the food), thinking it was his own. Knowing this, he reprimanded him, . . . "There is no offence, monk, as you thought it was your own." || 20 ||

At one time mango-tree thieves, having made the mangoes fall, went off taking a bundle of fruit. The owners pursued these thieves. The thieves, seeing the owners, dropped the bundle and ran away. The monks, thinking it to be rags taken from the dust-heap, had it procured, and ate (the mangoes). The owners reprimanded these monks, saying: "You are not (true) recluses." These were remorseful. They told this matter to the lord. "Monks, of what were you thinking?" he said.

"Lord, we thought they were rags taken from the dust-heap," they said.

"Monks, there is no offence, since you thought they were rags taken from the dust-heap."

At one time rose-apple tree thieves . . . bread-fruit tree thieves . . . jack-fruit thieves . . . palm-fruit thieves . . . sugar-cane thieves . . . cucumber thieves, **[60]** having cut off cucumbers, went away, taking a bundle. The owners . . . "There is no offence, monks, since you thought they were rags taken from the dust-heap." || 21 ||

At one time mango-tree thieves having made the

---

[1] *paṭivisa.*

mangoes fall . . . ran away. The monks saying: "Before the owners see them," and intending to steal, ate (the mangoes). The owners reprimanded the monks, saying: "You are not (true) recluses." These were remorseful. . . . "You, monks, have fallen into an offence involving defeat."

At one time rose-apple tree thieves . . . cucumber thieves . . . ran away. The monks saying: "Before the owners see them," and intending to steal, ate (the cucumbers). The owners . . . "You, monks, have fallen into an offence involving defeat." || 22 ||

At one time a certain monk, intending to steal, stole a mango belonging to the Order . . . a rose-apple . . . a bread-fruit . . . a jack-fruit . . . a palm-fruit . . . a sugar-cane . . . intending to steal, stole a cucumber belonging to the Order. He was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat." || 23 ||

At one time a certain monk, going to a flower-garden intending to steal, stole a flower worth five *māsakas* that had been (already) plucked off. He was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat."

At one time a certain monk, going to a flower-garden intending to steal, and picking a flower worth five *māsakas*, stole it. He was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat." || 24 ||

At one time a certain monk as he was going to the village said to another monk: "Your reverence, do you allow me to take your greetings[1] to the family which supports you?" Going (there), having had an outer

[1] *Vutto vajjemî ti*. *VA*. 382 says that this means, "being spoken to by you, I speak on your behalf." Hence the one who takes the message of greeting will be treated at the house in the same way as is the regular diner there. Thus *vutto vadeti* means: to greet somebody on the part of somebody. The offence would seem to lie in the substitution of one monk for another. *VA*. 382 implies that it is allowed for one monk to take greetings from another if he is going to ask for something definite.

cloak fetched, he enjoyed it by himself. He, knowing this, reprimanded him, saying: "You are not a (true) recluse." He was remorseful. . . . "Monk, there is no offence involving defeat. But, monks, you should not say: 'May I take greetings (from you)?' Who should speak thus—there is an offence of wrong-doing."

At one time a certain monk went to the village. A certain monk said to this monk: "Your reverence, take greetings from me to the family which supports me." Going (there) and having a pair of outer cloaks fetched, he used one himself, one he gave to that monk. He, knowing this, reprimanded him, saying: "You are not a (true) recluse." He was remorseful. . . . "Monk, there is no offence involving defeat. But, monks, you should not say: 'Take greetings (from me).' Who should speak thus—there is an offence of wrong-doing."

At one time a certain monk as he was going to the village [61] said to another monk: "Your reverence, may I take greetings to the family which supports you?" He spoke thus: "Take greetings from me." Going (there), he had fetched an *āḷhaka* measure[1] of ghee, a

[1] See Rhys Davids, *Ancient Coins*, etc., pp. 18-20. *VA*. 702 gives a discussion on the *āḷhaka*, from which it appears that it was a very variable measure: "'takes half an *āḷhaka* of gruel' means: takes the gruel made from two *nāḷis* of uncooked rice according to the Magadha *nāḷi*. In the Andha Commentary a Magadha *nāḷi* is said to be thirteen and a half *palas* (a weight). The *nāḷi* in use in the Island of Ceylon is larger than the Tamil *nāḷi*. The small Magadha *nāḷi* is the right measure. In the Great Commentary it is said that one Sinhalese *nāḷi* is equal to one and a half of this Magadha *nāḷi*."

At *SnA*. 476 it is said that four *patthas* make an *āḷhaka*, reckoning by the Kosala *patthas*, and that four *āḷhakas* make a *doṇa*. See *Ancient Coins*, etc., p. 18, and *cf.* above, p. 12, on *pattha*.

This word *āḷhaka* is the same as that which occurs in the name of one of the games, *pattâḷhaka*, *Vin*. iii. 180, *D*. i. 6, *M*. i. 166. The various *Comys*. always explain as *paṇṇanāḷika*, a *nāḷika* measure of leaves. *Nāḷika*=*nāḷi*.

At *A*. ii. 55=ii. 337 *āḷhaka* is used in connection with the "ocean." It is therefore a liquid as well as a dry measure. It is trans. as "gallon" at *G.S.* ii. 64, and as "pailful" at *G.S.* iii. 237. At *Vin*. i. 240 it occurs in the compound *āḷhakathālikā*, trans. at *Vin. Texts* ii. 122, "pint pots." At *A*. iii. 369 it occurs again in this

tulā measure[1] of sugar and a *doṇa* measure[2] of husked rice, which he ate by himself. Knowing this, he reprimanded him, saying: "You are not a (true) recluse." He was remorseful. . . . "Monk, there is no offence involving defeat. But, monks, you should not say: 'May I take greetings from you?' nor should you say: 'Take greetings from me.' Who should speak thus—there is an offence of wrong-doing." ||25||

At one time a certain man, taking a valuable jewel, was going along the high road in the company of a certain monk. Then the man, seeing the customs house, put the jewel into the monk's wallet without his knowing it, (and so) he took it past the customs house. He was remorseful. . . . "Monk, of what were you thinking?"

"I did not know, lord," he said.

"There is no offence, monk, since you did not know."

At one time a certain man, taking a valuable jewel, . . . seeing the customs house, pretended to be ill, and gave his own bundle to the monk. When the man had passed the customs house, he said to the monk: "Give me my bundle, honoured sir, I am not indisposed."

"Why did you do that, your reverence?" Then the man told this matter to the monk. He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence, monk, since you did not know."

At one time a certain monk was going along a high

same compound; trans. at *G.S.* iii. 262, "as big as pipkins," with commentarial exegesis, n. 6, *taṇḍulâḷhakassa bhattapacana-thālikā*, which seems to mean "a small bowl for cooking food to the extent of an *āḷhaka* of unboiled rice." Same compound *āḷhakathālikā* occurs at *DhA.* iii. 370, with *v.l. bhattathālikā*, as though the bowl of an *āḷhaka*'s capacity were being identified with a bowl of food.

[1] *Tulā* is some kind of measure. At *S.* ii. 236=*A.* i. 88 Khemā and Uppalavaṇṇā are called the *tulā pamāṇa* (measure) of the disciples who are nuns. *Tulā* at *AA.* ii. 157 simply seems to mean standard or weight. The Abhidhānappadīpikā (a late work), § 481, says that a *tulā* is a hundred *palas*.

[2] Usually four *āḷhakas* make a *doṇa*. See note 1, page 103.

road in the company of a caravan. A certain man, seeing the customs house and bribing[1] a monk, gave this monk a valuable jewel, saying: "Honoured sir, get this jewel past the customs house." So the monk took the jewel past the customs house. He was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat." || 26 ||

At one time a certain monk out of compassion released a pig trapped in a snare. He was remorseful. . . . "Of what were you thinking, monk?"

"I acted from a compassionate motive, lord,"[2] he said.

"There is no offence, monk, since you acted from a compassionate motive."

At one time a certain monk released a pig trapped in a snare, intending to steal it "before the owners see it." He was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat."

At one time a certain monk out of compassion released a deer trapped in a snare . . . released a deer trapped in a snare intending to steal it [62] before the owners saw it . . . out of compassion released fish trapped in a fish-net . . . released fish trapped in a fish-net intending to steal them "before the owners see them." He was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat." || 27 ||

At one time a certain monk, seeing some goods in a vehicle, said: "If I take these from here I shall become one who is defeated." As he was passing, he took hold of it, pushing it along. He was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat." || 28 ||

At one time a certain monk, saying: "I will give the owners a piece of flesh taken up by a hawk," took hold of it. The owners reprimanded this monk, saying: "You are not a (true) recluse." He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence, monk, since you did not intend to steal."

---

[1] *āmisena upalāpetvā*, lit. cajoling with a reward.

[2] lit. I am one who has a sense of compassion.

At one time a certain monk, intending to steal a piece of flesh taken up by a hawk "before the owners see it," took hold of it. The owners reprimanded the monk, saying: "You are not a (true) recluse." He was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat." || 29 ||

At one time some men who had put a raft together, stowed it away on the river Aciravatī.[1] As the bindings were torn they went away (leaving it) all strewn over with sticks. The monks, thinking that these were rags taken from the dust-heap, got them out of the water. The owners reprimanded these monks, saying: "You are not (true) recluses." They were remorseful. . . . "Monks, there is no offence, since you thought that they were rags taken from the dust-heap."

At one time some men who had put a raft together, stowed it away on the river Aciravatī. As the bindings were torn they went away (leaving it) all strewn over with sticks. The monks, intending to steal, got them out of the water "before the owners see them." The owners reprimanded the monks, saying: "You are not (true) recluses." They were remorseful. . . . "You monks, have fallen into an offence involving defeat." || 30 ||

At one time a certain cowherd, hanging his cloak on a tree, went to relieve himself. A certain monk took it thinking it was a rag taken from the dust-heap. Then the cowherd reprimanded that monk, saying: "You are not a (true) recluse." He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence, monk, since you thought it was a rag taken from the dust-heap." || 31 ||

At one time, as a certain monk was crossing a river, a cloak that had escaped from the bleachers' hands, stuck to his foot. The monk took hold of it, saying: "I will give this to the owners." The owners repri-

[1] B. C. Law, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, p. 36: "Aciravatī is the river Rapti in Oudh, on which the town of Sāvatthī was situated."

manded that monk, saying: "You are not a (true) recluse." He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence, monk, because you did not intend to steal."

At one time, as a certain monk was crossing a river, a cloak that had escaped from the bleachers' hands stuck to his foot. [63] The monk took hold of it, intending to steal it "before the owners see." The owners reprimanded the monk, saying: "You are not a (true) recluse." He was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat." || 32 ||

At one time a certain monk, seeing a large round pot of ghee, ate it little by little. He was remorseful. . . . "Monk, there is no offence involving defeat, there is an offence of wrong-doing." || 33 ||

At one time a company of monks, having arranged together,[1] went away, saying: "We will steal these goods." One (of them) stole the goods. The others said: "We are not those who are defeated; the thief is one who is defeated." They told this matter to the lord. He said: "You, monks, have fallen into an offence involving defeat."

At one time a company of monks, having arranged together, and having stolen some goods, shared them out. Amongst those sharing, none had a portion amounting to five *māsakas*. They said: "We are not those who are defeated." They told this matter to the lord. He said: "You, monks, have fallen into an offence involving defeat." || 34 ||

At one time a certain monk, intending to steal, stole a handful of rice belonging to a shop-keeper at a time when Sāvatthī was short of alms-food. He was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat."

At one time a certain monk, intending to steal, stole a handful of kidney-beans . . . a handful of beans . . . a handful of sesamum belonging to a shop-keeper at a time when Sāvatthī was short of alms-food. He was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat." || 35 ||

[1] *saṃvidahitvā*, also above, Pār. II. **4**, 29, where the rule is laid down.

At one time thieves in the Dark Wood at Sāvatthī having killed a cow, eaten the flesh and tidied up the remains, went away. The monks, thinking that these were rags taken from the dust-heap, took them up and ate them. The thieves reprimanded these monks, saying: "You are not (true) recluses." They were remorseful. . . . "There is no offence, monks, since you thought that they were rags taken from the dust-heap."

At one time thieves in the Dark Wood at Sāvatthī having killed a pig . . . ". . . since you thought they were rags taken from the dust-heap." || 36 ||

At one time a certain monk going to a meadow, intending to steal, stole some cut grass worth five *māsakas*. He was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat."

At one time a certain monk going to a meadow, intending to steal, cutting grass worth five *māsakas*, stole it. He was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat." || 37 || [64]

At one time some in-coming monks having divided the (fruits of a) mango-tree belonging to the Order, ate them. The resident[1] monks reprimanded these monks, saying: "You are not (true) recluses." They were remorseful. They told this matter to the lord. "Of what were you thinking, monks?" he said.

"Lord, it was for the sake of food for us," they said.

"There is no offence, monks, since it was (done) for the sake of food."

At one time some in-coming monks . . . a rose-apple tree belonging to the Order . . . a bread-fruit tree belonging to the Order . . . a jack-fruit tree . . . palm fruits . . . a sugar-cane . . . a cucumber-tree belonging to the Order, had (the various fruits) shared out and ate them. The resident monks . . . "There is no offence, monks, since it was (done) for the sake of food." || 38 ||

At one time keepers of a mango-grove gave a mango-

[1] *Āvāsika.*

fruit to some monks. The monks, saying: "The masters[1] (are) to watch these, not to give them away," being scrupulous, did not accept them. They told this matter to the lord. He said: "There is no offence, monks, since it was a gift from the guardian."

At one time keepers of a rose-apple grove . . . a cucumber-plantation gave cucumbers to the monks. The monks, saying: "these masters . . ." "There is no offence, monks, since it was a gift from the guardian." || 39 ||

At one time a certain monk having removed for the time being a piece of wood belonging to the Order, shored up the wattle and daub wall of his own vihāra (with it). The monks reprimanded this monk, saying: "You are not a (true) recluse." He was remorseful. He told this matter to the lord. He said: "Monk, of what were you thinking?"

"I (took it) for the time being, lord," he said.

"There is no offence, monk, in taking for the time being."[2] || 40 ||

At one time a certain monk, intending to steal, stole water belonging to the Order . . . clay belonging to the Order . . . intending to steal, stole *tiṇa*-grass belonging to the Order. He was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat."

At one time a certain monk, intending to steal, set fire to *tiṇa*-grass belonging to the Order. He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence, monk, involving defeat; there is an offence of wrong-doing." || 41 ||

At one time a certain monk, intending to steal, stole a couch belonging to the Order. He was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat."

At one time a certain monk, intending to do so, stole a chair belonging to the Order . . . stole a pillow . . . a bolster and pillow . . . a door . . . a case-

[1] *Issara.*

[2] *Cf.* below, p. 110.

ment[1] . . . with intention to do so, stole a rafter[2] belonging to the Order. He was remorseful. . . . " . . . defeat." || 42 ||

At one time monks [65] enjoyed elsewhere the lodging and food of a vihāra[3] belonging to a certain lay-follower.[4] Then this lay-follower was vexed, annoyed and angry. He said:

" How can the revered sirs, enjoy elsewhere appurtenances belonging somewhere else?" They told this matter to the lord. " Monks, one should not enjoy elsewhere appurtenances belonging somewhere else. Who enjoys himself (in this way)—there is an offence of wrong-doing." || 43 ||

At one time monks, feeling remorse at having taken[5] in to the hall in which the Pāṭimokkha was held and the meeting-place, sat down on the ground. Their limbs and robes were covered with dust. They told this matter to the lord.[6] " I allow you, monks, to take (things) away temporarily."[7] || 44 ||

At one time at Campā,[8] the nun who was the pupil of the nun Thullanandā went to the family who supported the nun Thullanandā, and said: " The lady[9] wants to drink[10] rice-gruel containing the three pungent

---

[1] *ālokasandhi, cf. Vin.* i. 48; ii. 209=218.
[2] *gopanāsi, cf. A.* i. 261; *M.* i. 80.
[3] *Vihāraparibhoga.* See *Vin.* ii. 174.
[4] Thus he could not give them to senior monks coming in, *VA.* 391.
[5] *VA.* 390, a couch or chair.
[6] Part of the story seems to be omitted.
[7] =*Vin.* ii. 174. See also above, p. 109. *Tāvakālika*, trans. at *Vin. Texts* iii. 217 as " for a certain time only "; and at *Dial.* ii. 195 =*Buddhist Suttas,* second edition, p. 241 (trans. of *Jā.* i. 393), as " only for a time . . . as temporary " (word occurring twice). At *Vin. Texts* ii. 154, n. 7, editor says *tāvakālika* means " only for a time, temporary, on loan," and translates it by " on loan " at *Vin. Texts* ii. 347 (=*Vin.* ii. 174). At *Jā.* i. 121 the word is used of a cart taken on hire. *Cf. Vin.* iv. 286, when it is not considered an offence to give recluses robes temporarily.
[8] The ancient capital of Aṅga.
[9] *Ayyā.*
[10] *Pātun*, inf. of *pivati,* balanced by *khāditun* in the next story.

ingredients,"[1] and having had this cooked, she took it away with her and enjoyed it herself. She, knowing this, reprimanded her, saying: "You are not a (true) female recluse." She was remorseful. Then this nun told this matter to the nuns. The nuns told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the lord. "Monks, there is no offence involving defeat; in the deliberate lie there is an offence involving expiation."

At one time in Rājagaha, the nun who was the pupil of the nun Thullanandā went to the family who supported the nun Thullanandā, and said: "The lady[2] wants to eat a honey-ball,"[3] and having had this cooked, she took it away with her and enjoyed it herself. She, knowing this . . . "involving defeat; in the deliberate lie there is an offence involving expiation." || 45 ||

At one time in Vesālī, the householder who was the supporter of the venerable Ajjuka had two children, a son and a nephew. Then the householder spoke thus to the venerable Ajjuka:

"Honoured sir, will you grant an audience[4] to whichever of these two children has faith and belief?" At that time the householder's nephew had faith and belief. So the venerable Ajjuka granted an audience to that child. Because he was wealthy he set up an estate and

[1] *Tekaṭulayāgu.* *VA.* 391 says "made with either *tila* (sesamum), *taṇḍula* (rice-grain), *mugga* (kidney-beans), or *tila, taṇḍula,* and *māsa* (a bean), or *tila, taṇḍula* and *kulattha* (a kind of vetch), or any one prepared grain with *tila* and *taṇḍula,* making three (ingredients)." *Cf.* above, p. 83, n. 4. The word *tekaṭulayāgu* also occurs at *Vin.* i. 210, where Gotama is said to make this gruel of *tila, taṇḍula* and *mugga.* Ed. at *Vin. Texts* ii. 68, n. 2, says *kaṭu* means pungent, and that these three substances are explained to be ginger and two kinds of pepper. Apparently the gruel could be made of three kinds of grain and flavoured with three spices. But *VA.* 391 says: "It is said that they make this (gruel) mixing these three (prepared grains) in milk and four parts of water and adding ghee, honey and molasses."

[2] *Ayyā.*

[3] *Madhugoḷaka.* *P.T.S. Dict.* gives only one reference to *goḷaka* at *ThigA.* 255; and under *kīḷā-goḷaka* to *Vism.* 256 (*cf. KhA.* 53). *VA.* 391 defines *madhugoḷaka* as *atirasapūva,* which seems to mean a "very tasty cake."

[4] *Okāsa.*

made a gift. Then the householder's son said to the venerable Ānanda:

"Honoured Ānanda, which is the father's heir, the son or the nephew?"

"The son, your reverence, is the father's heir."

"Honoured sir, this master Ajjuka has shown that our wealth belongs to our associate."

"Your reverence, the venerable Ajjuka is not a (true) recluse." Then the venerable Ajjuka said to the venerable Ānanda:

"Reverend Ānanda, give me a trial." **[66]**

At that time the venerable Upāli[1] was an adherent of the venerable Ajjuka. Then the venerable Upāli said to the venerable Ānanda:

"Reverend Ānanda, whoever being told by the owner: 'Grant this audience to such and such a person,' granted it—does he fall?"

"Honoured sir, he does not fall at all, (not) even to the length of an offence of wrong-doing," he said.

"Your reverence, this venerable Ajjuka, being told by the owner: 'Grant this audience to such and such a person,' granted it. Your reverence, there is no offence for the venerable Ajjuka." || 46 ||

Now at that time at Benares the family which supported the venerable Pilindavaccha[2] was pillaged by thieves, and two children were kidnapped. Then the venerable Pilindavaccha leading back these children by his psychic power placed them on a terrace. People, seeing these children, said:

---

[1] See above, p. 60, n. 4.

[2] *Vin.* i. 206 ff.=iii. 248 ff. recounts the feats he did by his mystic potency in Rājagaha when Bimbisāra was King of Magadha. At *A.* i. 24 he is called "chief among the disciples who are dear and delightful to the devas." At *Ud.* 28 objections are raised to his "foul talk." I think he is probably the same as the Pilinda-Vaccha of *Thag.*; see *Pss. Breth.* ix. and *loc. cit.*, p. 14, n. 4; p. 15, n. 2. We learn from *Comy.* on *Thag.* that Pilinda was his name, Vaccha the name of his clan (*cf.* Vana-Vaccha, *Pss. Breth.* xiii.), and that he was waited on by a deva and acquired the Gandhāra charm. For this, see *D.* i. 213; *Jā.* iv. 498.

"This is the majesty of the psychic power of master Pilindavaccha!" and they put faith in the venerable Pilindavaccha. The monks became vexed, annoyed and angry, and said: "How can this venerable Pilindavaccha lead back children who had been kidnapped by thieves?" They told this matter to the lord. He said: "Monks, there is no offence for one who possesses psychic power in the sphere of psychic power." || 47 ||

At one time, two monks, Paṇḍaka and Kapila,[1] were friends. One lived in a village and one at Kosambī. Then as that monk was going from the village to Kosambī, crossing a river, in the middle of the way a piece of fat, escaped from the hands of pork-butchers, stuck to his foot. The monk took hold of it, saying: "I will give it to the owners." The owners reprimanded that monk, saying: "You are not a (true) recluse." A woman cowherd who saw him as he had crossed, said:

"Come, honoured sir, commit sexual intercourse." He said: "By nature I am not a (true) recluse," and having committed sexual intercourse with her and gone to Kosambī, he told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the lord. He said: "Monks, there is no offence involving defeat for taking what is not given[2]; but there is an offence involving defeat for sexual intercourse in conjunction (with another)." || 48 ||

Now at that time at Sāgalā,[3] a monk who shared a cell with the venerable Daḷhika, being tormented by

[1] Mentioned, I think, nowhere but here. Naturally not the Kapila to whom *MA.* i. 91 refers as the depraved monk (*cf. Vin.* iii. 107), reborn with his *saṅghāṭi*-robe flaming.

[2] For he did not intend to steal it.

[3] See *Miln*, p. 1, for description of a city of this name. A Sāgalā, capital of the kingdom of the Maddas, is mentioned at *Jā.* iv. 230; v. 283, 285, 289 f.; vi. 471.

chafing,[1] took a tradesman's turban,[2] and said to the venerable Daḷhika: "Honoured sir, I am not a (true) recluse, I will leave the Order."[3]

"What was done by you, your reverence?" He told him this matter.

"Having taken it, you value it, but being valued it is not worth five *māsakas*. There is no offence, your reverence, involving defeat," he said, and gave dhamma-talk. That monk was delighted.[4] || 49 || 7 ||

Told is the second Offence involving Defeat

---

[1] *Anabhiratiyā pīḷito*. *Vin. Texts* iii. 77, n. 3, says, "this anabhirati is constantly referred to, and always as the result of falling in love, or in connection with sexual desire." I think it is then not so much the "distaste (for meditation)," as stated at *Vin. Texts* iii. 77, as the actual dis-ease of unsatisfied sexual needs. We have, however, now had the words *abhirata* and *anabhirata* several times, and not always in such a connection. Thus at pp. 24, 25, the verb clearly means no more than to enjoy the ordinary and varied delights of the household life, such as music and nautch girls dancing; as at p. 32 it simply means to be delighted with the Brahma-life. But at p. 34 it might be thought that, by implication, *anabhirata* means dissatisfied, longing for sexual intercourse. At p. 43 it might only mean a vague fretting, or it might have a more definite and specialised sense.

[2] *Veṭhana*, possibly a wrap or a cloak, as at *Jā*. vi. 12, taken as a disguise. A wrap to put over the "yellow robes" would have been a better disguise than a turban, but could a wrap possibly have been worth less than five *māsakas*? A turban, on the other hand, would have hidden the shaven head, but that is all. Perhaps it was meant symbolically.

[3] *Vibbhamissāmi*. On those occasions when *anabhirati* is in connection with sexual desire, it would look as if *vibbhamissāmi* should then be translated, "I will co-habit," and not as "I will leave the Order." But except for the occurrence of *anabhirati* in the above story, I see doubtful justification for such a rendering of *vibbhamissāmi* here. For the point of the story is that the monk has taken something worth less than five *māsakas*, which does not rank as a theft. However, we must remember that in the preceding story the offence is shown to be that of sexual intercourse, and not that of taking what was not given. Something of the same sort may have been here originally, but left out by a redactor.

[4] *abhirami*, aor. of *abhiramati*. I cannot help thinking that this word in this rather curious ending of the second Pārājika is meant to balance the *an-abhirati* with which this story began. *Abhiramati* and *abhirati* both derive from *abhi+ram*. It is most

rare to find it said that a monk, when told that there is for him no offence, "was delighted," and I more than ever believe that there are omissions in the text as we have it. I do not believe that the monk "was delighted" that he had committed no offence. I believe that in his appropriated *veṭhana*, he enjoyed himself (a meaning of *abhiramati*), or even fell in love (another meaning, *cf.* *Sn.* 718, 1085), which would balance the *anabhiraṭi* of the opening sentence. I think, in fact, that this story was meant to end up in exactly the same way as the preceding one. But as the material for this is wanting, I have left the phrase as "was delighted."

DEFEAT (PĀRĀJIKA) III

At one time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Vesālī in the pavilion of the Gabled Hall in the Great Wood. At that time the lord talked in many ways to the monks on the subject of the impure,[1] he spoke in praise of the impure, he spoke in praise of developing (contemplation of) the impure,[2] he spoke thus and thus[3] in praise of taking the impure as a stage in meditation. Then the lord addressed the monks thus:

"I wish, monks, to go into solitary retreat for a half-month; I do not wish anyone to come up to me except the one who brings my alms-food."[4]

"Very well, lord," the monks answered the lord, and accordingly no one went up to the lord except the one to take him alms-food. Then the monks said: "The lord has talked in many ways on the subject of the impure, he spoke in praise of the impure, he spoke in praise of developing (the contemplation of) the impure, he spoke in praise of taking the impure as a stage in meditation." These (monks) dwelt intent upon the practice of developing (contemplation of) the impure in its many different aspects; (but) they were troubled by their own bodies,[5] ashamed of them, loathing them.

---

[1] *VA.* 393 f. *Cf. Bud. Psych. Ethics*, 2nd edition, 63, n. 2.

[2] *asubhabhāvanā*, *VA.* 394 says, *pavatassa cittassa bhāvanā vaḍḍhanā phātikammaṃ*, and goes on to say that the monk intent upon the impure attains the first musing, and then making insight to grow, he reaches the highest goal (*uttamattha*), arahanship.

[3] *ādissa ādissa*, expl. at *VA.* 394: *evam pi ittham pîti punappuna vavatthānaṃ katvā.*

[4] As at *S.* v. 320, where the subject of *asubha*, the impure or "the unlovely," also occurs, but with some omissions and variations.

[5] *sakena kāyena*, trans. at *K.S.* v. 284 "as to this body."

It is as if a woman or a man when young and of tender years and fond of ornaments,[1] having washed (himself and his) head,[2] should be troubled, ashamed, full of loathing because of the carcase of a snake or of a dog or of a man hanging round the neck—even so, those monks who are troubled by their own bodies, ashamed of them and loathing them, both by themselves deprive themselves of life,[3] and (also) deprive one another of life.[4] Having come up to Migalaṇḍika,[5] a sham recluse,[6] they said:

"Be so good, your reverence, as to deprive us of life; this bowl and robe will become yours." Then Migalaṇḍika, the sham recluse, a hireling[7] for a bowl and robe,

---

[1] =*D*. i. 80=*Vin*. ii. 255=*M*. ii. 19; this simile omitted at *S*. v. 320.

[2] *VA*. 399, "washed, together with the head."

[3] *attanâpi attānaṃ jīvitā voropenti*. *VA*. 399 says, "like that man, having no desire for the carcase, the monks being desirous of quitting (*pariccajati*) their own bodies, taking the knife *attanâpi* . . . *voropenti*." This is probably a way of saying that they committed suicide, *cf*. *S*. v. 320, *satthahārakaṃ pariyesanti* . . . *satthaṃ āharanti*. Or the phrase might possibly mean that "the self deprives the Self of life"—*i.e.*, there may be some notion lingering on from the Upaniṣad philosophy that this kind of slaying affects the Ātman, the All-Real, the Self. Some other *attā* couples of sayings occur in the Aṅg.—*e.g.*, at *A*. i. 57, 149; iv. 405; v. 182, and at *S*. ii. 68, and seem to have this implication.

[4] *VA*. 399, "'You deprive me of life, I you,' thus they deprived one other of life."

[5] *VA*. 399 calls him Migaladdhika, with *v.l.* as in the text. He is not mentioned at *S*. v. 320, nor as far as I know at any other passage.

[6] *VA*. 399, *samaṇakuttaka=samaṇavesadhāraka*, one who wears a recluse's dress. "Having shaved his head and put on one yellow robe and another over his shoulder, depending on the vihāra, he lived on a substance of broken-meats."

[7] *bhaṭa*, *Comy*. is silent. If *bhaṭa* means soldier, *cf*. *S.B.E.* trans. of *Miln*. 234, 240, the sense would be that he hit about him with a knife, and perhaps stifled the monks with his robe. But *bhaṭa* can also mean "hireling, servant." There seems to be no verb in Pali of which it is the p.p. It is connected with the Epic and Class. Sanskrit *bhaṭa*, which is connected with *bhṛta*. Monier Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, gives for this: "hired, kept in pay, paid; possessed of, endowed with, having earned, acquired, gained . . ."

deprived the company of monks of life, and taking a blood-stained knife came up to the banks of the river Vaggumudā.[1] Then while Migalaṇḍika, the sham recluse, was washing the large blood-stained knife, he became remorseful, he became repentant. "That is bad for me, that is not good for me, that was wrongly gotten by me, that was not [68] rightly gotten by me, indeed much demerit attaches to me because I deprived of life monks who were virtuous and of good conduct."

Then a certain devatā[2] of the retinue of Māra, coming on unbroken water[3] said to Migalaṇḍika, the sham recluse: "It is good, very man,[4] it is good; very man, it is good for you; very man, it is rightly gotten by you; very man, much merit attaches to you because you bring those across who had not crossed."[5]

---

[1] *VA.* 399 says, "a river considered by people to be lovely (*vaggu-matā*, *mata* from *maññati*), renowned for merit. He went there saying, 'There I will wash away this evil.'"

[2] *VA.* 400 says, "not a well-known earth-devatā, a holder of false views, on the side of Māra, taking Māra's part."

[3] *abhijjamāne udake gantvā.* *VA.* 400 says, "coming as though walking on the earth's surface." This power of walking on the water is one of the forms of *iddhi*, see *D.* i. 78. *Bhijjamāna* is pres. part. of *bhijjati*, passive of *bhindati*+*a*, not being broken, or divided, therefore firm, unruffled, undivided, unbroken, undisturbed. But the reading at *D.* i. 78=*A.* i. 170 is *udake pi abhijjamāno gacchati*, he goes on the water without breaking it (*Dial.* i. 88 and *cf.* *A.* i. 255), but this loses the passive aspect of the verb. At *D.* i. 212 we get *udake abhijjamānaṃ gacchantaṃ.* However at *M.* i. 34=494 the reading is (as at *Vin.* iii. above) *udake pi abhijjamāne*, trans. *Fur. Dial.* i. 24, "on the water's unbroken surface." Thus, there is a good deal of variation in the reading of *abhijj°*. See *Pṭs.* ii. 208 which reads *°māne*, and says that as ordinary people walk on the earth, so the psychic person (*iddhimā*) walks on the unbroken water, having first reflected on it. *Vism.* 396, in explaining how by will-power such a person transforms the water to earth, quotes this *Pṭs.* passage.

[4] *sappurisa.* On prefix *sa-* see *G.S.* 1. ix.

[5] *atiṇṇe tāresi*, *VA.* 401, "You free them from saṃsāra . . . those who are not dead are not freed from saṃsāra, those who are dead are freed." *Tarati*, to cross, was frequently used in connection with *ogha*, the flood, *mahôgha*, the great flood. The flood was later broken up into four floods, which became identified with the four āsavas. But the commentarial exegesis, as above, which is not rare, shows the view that to be across was to be across nothing

Then Migalaṇḍika, the sham recluse, said: " It is said that it is good for me, it is said that it is rightly gotten by me, it is said that much merit attaches to me, it is said that I bring those across who had not crossed," and taking a sharp knife and going from vihāra to vihāra and from cell to cell,[1] he said: " Who has not crossed? Whom do I bring across?" Then those monks who were not devoid of passion were frightened at that time,[2] in a state of consternation,[3] their hair standing on end; but those monks who were devoid of passion were not frightened at that time, nor were they in a state of consternation, nor did their hair stand on end. Then Migalaṇḍika, the sham recluse, on a single day deprived one monk of life, on a single day he deprived two monks of life, on a single day . . . three . . ., on a single day . . . four . . ., on a single day . . . five . . ., on a single day . . . ten . . ., on a single day . . . twenty . . ., on a single day . . . thirty . . ., on a single day . . . forty . . ., on a single day . . . fifty . . ., on a single day he deprived sixty monks of life. || 1 ||

Now the lord, at the end of the half-month, arising from his retreat for meditation, addressed the venerable Ānanda: " Ānanda, how is it that the company of monks is so diminished as it is?"

---

more nor less than *saṃsāra*, the round of death and rebirth. This is what, in the monkish outlook of the commentator, it was highly desirable to stop. *Cf. Sn.* 571, *tiṇṇo tāres' imaṃ pajaṃ.*

[1] =*Vin.* i. 216=247. On *pariveṇa*, cell, see *Vin. Texts* iii. 109, n. 3, where editor says that it is here doubtless a cell used as a cooling room, after the steam bath. But at *Vin. Texts* iii. 203 editor takes *pariveṇa* to mean " a number of buildings," in n. 1 saying that " here it evidently included several vihāras."

[2] *Tasmiṃ samaye.*

[3] *Chambhitatta. Cf. D.* i. 49. *P.T.S. Dict.* says that here *DA.* i. 50 wrongly explains it by *sakala-sarīra-calanaṃ. VA.* 401 reads, " beginning with the flesh of the heart, the body trembled (*sarīracalanaṃ*)"; it speaks of those being devoid of passion as being *khīṇâsava.* It also gives *thambhitatta* as a synonym of *chambhitatta. P.T.S. Dict.* says that this meaning of *thambhitatta* as fluctuation, unsteadiness, is late, and is caused by misinterpretation of *chambhitatta.*

"It is because, lord, the lord talked to the monks in many ways on the subject of the impure: he spoke in praise of the impure, he spoke in praise of increasing (contemplation of) the impure, he spoke in praise of taking the impure as a stage in meditation. And, lord, those monks said: 'The lord has talked in many ways on the subject of the impure, he spoke in praise of the impure, spoke in praise of increasing (contemplation of) the impure, he spoke in praise of taking the impure as a stage in meditation'—(so) those (monks) dwelt intent upon the practice of contemplating the impure in its many different aspects. (But) they were troubled by their own bodies, ashamed of them, loathing them. It is as if a woman or a man, when young and of tender years and fond of ornaments, having washed (himself and his) head should be troubled, ashamed, full of loathing because of a carcase of a snake, of a dog or of a man hanging round the neck—even so, these monks who are troubled by their own bodies, [**69**] ashamed of them and loathing them, both by themselves deprive themselves of life, and (also) deprive one another of life. (For) having come up to Migalaṇḍika, the sham recluse, they said: 'Be so good, your reverence, as to deprive us of life; this bowl and robe will become yours.' Then, lord, Migalaṇḍika, the sham recluse, a hireling for a bowl and robe, on a single day deprived one monk of life . . . on a single day deprived sixty monks of life. It were good, lord, if the lord were to give another instruction,[1] so that the company of monks might be established in profound knowledge."[2]

(The lord) said: "Then, Ānanda, call together in the assembly-hall as many monks as dwell near Vesālī."

---

[1] *Pariyāya*. *VA*. 402 explains it by *kammaṭṭhāna*, basis for meditation.

[2] *Aññā*. See *Pss. Breth.*, Intr., p. xxxiii, and Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Birth of Indian Psychology*, etc., p. 225, where she says "*aññā—i.e.*, the having-come-to-know . . . had taken the place of the older Sakyan term for the *summum bonum*: *attha*, the thing needed, the thing sought;" and *ibid.*, p. 264, "coming-to-know or learning . . . as what might be rendered as gnosis or saving knowledge."

"Very well, lord," he said. And when the venerable Ānanda had answered the lord, and had called together in the assembly-hall as many monks as lived near Vesālī, he came up to the lord, and having come up to him, he said: "Lord, the company of monks is assembled. Lord, does the lord think[1] that it is now the right time for this?"

Then the lord came up to the assembly-hall, and having come up he sat down on the appointed seat. Sitting down, the lord addressed the monks, saying: ||2||

"This,[2] monks, is the concentration with mindfulness on in-breathing and out-breathing, which if developed and made much of[3] is good and excellent and pure[4] and is a happy way of living, and it immediately[5] destroys and allays the evil, wrong states which have arisen. If is as if, monks, in the last month of the hot weather[6] a big storm, arising out of season,[7] destroys and allays the dust and dirt that have formed—even so, monks, concentration with mindfulness on in-breathing and out-breathing, if developed and made much of is good and excellent and pure and is a happy way of living, and it immediately destroys and allays the evil, wrong states which have arisen. And how, monks, if concentration with mindfulness on in-breathing and out-breathing be developed and made much of, does what is good and excellent and pure and a happy way of living, immediately destroy and allay the evil, wrong states which arise?

Herein, monks, a monk going to the jungle, going

---

[1] *Maññasi.* At. *S.* v. 321, *maññati.*

[2] From here to end of ||3|| below=*S.* v. 321 f. exactly.

[3] *Cf. M.* i. 421.

[4] *Asecanaka.* *VA.* 403 f. says, *nâssa secananti* (adulterating, mixing, sprinkling), *anāsittako* (unsprinkled) *abbokiṇṇo pāṭekko āveṇiko.* *Cf. Thig.* ver. 55.

[5] *Ṭhānaso.* *VA.* 404 *khaṇen' eva.*

[6] Called *āsāḷhamāsa* at *VA.* 404.

[7] *VA.* 404 says: having arisen, the whole sky is covered, and for the whole half-month of the bright moon in this *āsāḷha* month there are clouds shedding rain.

to the foot of a tree, going to a lonely place, sits down cross-legged with back erect, having caused mindfulness to be present in front of him.[1] Mindful, he breathes out;[2] mindful, he breathes in; breathing out a long breath he knows, 'I am breathing out a long breath'; breathing in a long breath, he knows, 'I am breathing in a long breath'; breathing out a short breath, he knows, 'I am breathing out a short breath'; breathing in a short breath, he knows, 'I am breathing in a short breath'; he trains himself,[3] saying, 'I will breathe out, conscious of the whole body'; [**70**] he trains himself, saying, 'I will breathe in, conscious of the whole body'; he trains himself, saying, 'I will breathe out, quieting the body's constituents'; he trains himself, saying, 'I will breathe in, quieting the body's constituents'; he trains himself, saying, 'I will breathe out . . . I will breathe in, conscious of zest'; he trains himself, saying, 'I will breathe out . . . I will breathe in, conscious of ease'; he trains himself, saying, 'I will breathe out . . . I will breathe in, conscious of the mind's constituents'; he trains himself, saying, 'I will breathe out . . . I will breathe in, quieting the mind's constituents'; he trains himself, saying, 'I will breathe out . . . I will breathe in, conscious of the mind'; he trains himself, saying, '. . . satisfying the mind . . . composing the mind . . . detaching the mind . . . realising impermanence . . . realising passionlessness . . . realising stopping . . . realising renunciation.' Thus, monks, developing and making much of concentration with mindfulness on in-breathing and out-breathing, is good and excellent and pure, and is a happy way of living, and it immediately destroys and allays the evil, wrong states which have arisen." || 3 ||

Then the lord, for this reason, in this connection,

[1] *parimukhaṃ*. Or, "round the face."

[2] *Cf. D.* ii. 291=*M.* i. 56 for this passage, also *M.* iii. 82, 89, and *Pts.* i. 177, quoted *Vism.* 272.

[3] *Sikkhati*, *VA.* 411, *ghaṭati vāyamati*, and goes on to say he trains himself in the three trainings: the higher morality, the higher thought, the higher wisdom.

having had the company of monks convened, asked the monks:

"Monks, is it true, as is said, that monks by themselves deprived themselves of life, and (also) deprived one another of life, and having approached Migalaṇḍika, the sham recluse, spoke thus: 'Be so good, your reverence, as to deprive us of life; this bowl and robe will become yours.'"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "Monks, it is not becoming for these monks, it is not seemly, it is not fit, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not right, it should not be done. How can those monks by themselves deprive themselves of life . . . how can they say . . . 'this will become your bowl and robe?' Monks, this is not for the benefit of non-believers . . . and thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should intentionally deprive a human being of life, or should look about so as to be his knife-bringer, he is also one who is defeated, he is not in communion."

Thus this course of training for monks was made known by the lord. || 4 || **1** ||

At one time a certain lay-follower was ill. His wife was beautiful, comely and pleasant. The group of six monks were enamoured of this woman. Then the group of six monks thought: "If this [**71**] lay-follower lives, your reverences, we cannot take this woman; come, your reverences, let us praise the beauty of death to this lay-follower." So the group of six monks came up to the lay-follower, and having come up they said to the lay-follower:

"Lay-follower, you are one who has done what is good,[1] who has done what is profitable, who has won the

[1] *Cf. A.* ii. 174, 175; *It.*, p. 25.

shelter of the timid[1]; you have not done evil, you have not been cruel, you have not been violent; what is good has been done by you, what is evil has not been done by you. What need have you of this evil, difficult life? Death would be better for you than life. Hence, when you have done your time, at the breaking up of the body after death, you will pass to a happy bourn, to a heaven-world[2]; there,[3] possessed of and provided with five deva-like qualities of sensual pleasures,[4] you will amuse yourself."

Then the lay-follower said, "Masters, you spoke the truth, for I have done what is good, I have done what is profitable, I have won the shelter of the timid; I have not done evil, I have not been cruel, I have not been violent: what is good has been done by me, what is evil has not been done by me. What need have I of this evil, difficult life? Death would be better for me than life. Hence when I have done my time, at the breaking up of the body after death, I will pass to a happy bourn, a heaven-world, then possessed of and provided with the five deva-like qualities of sensual pleasures, I will amuse myself."

He ate detrimental soft foods and detrimental hard foods, he tasted detrimental savoury foods, he drank detrimental drinks,[5] and because he had eaten detrimental soft foods . . . detrimental drinks, a sore affliction arose,[6] on account of which he died.

His wife was grieved, vexed, angry, and said, "These

---

[1] *katabhīruttāṇa*, *VA*. 436 says that he has gained protection against the dread beings have at the time of dying, possibly by means of a charm (*parittā*) as is suggested by *Comy.* on *A*. ii. 174.

[2] J. Przyluski, *Le Concile de Rājagṛha*, p. 368, where he says that in the oldest (Buddhist) period *svarga* (Pali, *sagga*) and *brahmaloka* are synonymous terms. This seems here borne out by next sentence in text. It has been suggested, and confuted by Przyluski, *ibid.*, p. 371, that Aśoka spoke only of *svarga*, and not of *nirvāṇa*, because he addressed the laity, and not monks.

[3] *I.e.*, in a deva-world, *VA*. 436.

[4] *Cf. A*. v. 273.

[5] *Cf. Vin*. i. 44 for these four items.

[6] *Kharo ābādho uppajji*=*D*. ii. 127.

recluses, sons of the Sakyans,[1] are shameless, of low morality, liars. And they pretend to be dhamma-followers, walking by right, those leading the Brahma-life, speakers of truth, virtuous, of good character. There is no recluseship among these; there is no brahmanhood among these; destroyed is recluseship among these, destroyed is brahmanhood among these; where is recluseship among these, where is brahmanhood among these? Fallen from recluseship are these, fallen from brahmanhood are these. These praised the beauty of death to my husband; by these my husband has been killed."

And some people were angry and said, "... these have departed from brahmanhood. These praised the beauty of death to the lay-follower; by these the lay-follower has been killed."

The monks heard these people who were annoyed, vexed and angry. Those who were modest monks were annoyed, vexed, angry, and said: "How could the group of six monks praise the beauty of death to the lay-follower?" Then [72] these monks told this matter to the lord ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that you praised the beauty of death to the lay-follower?" he said.

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "Foolish men, it is not becoming, it is not seemly, it is not suitable, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not right, it should not be done. Why did you, foolish men, praise the beauty of death to the lay-follower? Foolish men, this is not for the benefit of non-believers ... And thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

"Whatever monk should intentionally deprive a human being of life or should look about so as to be his knife-bringer,[2] or should praise the beauty of death, or should

---

[1] As below, pp. 200, 223.

[2] *satthahārakaṃ vâssa pariyeseyya*. For lack of any better interpretation, explanation of *VA*. 441 is followed here. *Cf. S*. iv. 62; *M*. iii. 269.

incite (anyone) to death, saying, 'Hullo there, my man, of what use to you is this evil, difficult life? Death is better for you than life,' or who should deliberately[1] and purposefully[2] in various ways praise the beauty of death or should incite (anyone) to death: he also is one who is defeated, he is not in communion." ‖2‖

Whatever means: he who . . .

Monk means: . . . thus in this sense is monk to be understood.

Intentionally means: a transgression committed knowingly, consciously, deliberately.[3]

Human being[4] means: from the mind's first arising,[5] from (the time of) consciousness becoming first manifest in a mother's womb until the time of death, here meanwhile he is called a *human being*.

Should deprive of life means: he cuts off the faculty of life,[6] destroys it, harms its duration.

Or should look about so as to be his knife-bringer means: a knife or a dagger or an arrow or a cudgel or a stone or a sword or poison or a rope.[7]

---

[1] *iticittamano*, so the mind and thought; *VA*. 442 says, "so the mind, (or heart, *citta*), so the thought; 'death is better for you than life' here means: the mind set on death, thought set on death, wherefore thought is called the illustration of mind. From this meaning the two are as if one, therefore, no division is to be seen; as the mind so the thought, as the thought so the mind." This last phrase=p. 127 below, the old *Comy*. on this passage.

[2] *cittasaṃkappa*, intention of mind. On *saṃkappa*, as a term of "awareness, thought, reflection, purpose," see Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Birth of Indian Psychology*, etc., pp. 55 ff., 273 ff.

[3] =*Vin*. iv. 290, and =*Vin*. iii. 112 in expl. of *sañcetanika*. At *Vin*. ii. 91 it is said that whatever transgression is committed like this, is called a legal question whether an offence be wrong.

[4] *Manussaviggaha*.

[5] *VA*. 437 paraphrases by *paṭhamaṃ paṭisandhicittaṃ*, the mind being first reinstated.

[6] *Cf*. *Vbh*. 123.

[7] *Satthahāraka* as we have seen is lit. "sword-carrier," so that this definition probably implies "carrying a knife . . . carrying a rope." *Cf*. below, p. 133, where these items are grouped together under "a trap."

Or should praise the beauty of death means: he shows danger in living, and speaks praise of death.

Or should incite (one) to death means: he says, 'take a sword or eat poison or do your time, having hanged yourself with a rope.'

Hullo there, my man, means: this is a form of address.

Of what use to you is this evil, difficult life means: life is called *evil*: the life of the poor is evil compared to the life of the rich, the life of the unwealthy is evil compared to the life of the wealthy; the life of mankind is evil compared to the life of devas. [**73**] *Difficult life*[1] means: when the hands are cut off, when the feet are cut off, when (both) the hands and feet are cut off, when the ears are cut off, when the nose is cut off, when (both) the ears and the nose are cut off. Because of this evil and because of this difficult life he says, 'Death is better for you than life.'

Deliberately means: as the mind so the thought, as the thought so the mind.

Purposefully means: conscious of death, thinking of death, intending death.

In many ways means: in manifold manners.

Or should praise the beauty of death means: he shows danger in living and speaks of the beauty of death, saying, "You, deceasing hence, at the breaking up of the body after death, will pass to a happy bourn, a heaven-world; there, possessed of and provided with five deva-like qualities of sensual pleasures, you will amuse yourself."

Or should incite (one) to death means: he says, "take a sword, or eat poison, or do your time having hanged yourself with a rope, or falling into a deep ravine, or into a pit, or down a steep precipice.[2]

He also means: is called so, referring to the preceding.[3]

Is one who is defeated means: just as a flat stone

---

[1] *dujjīvita.*

[2] *VA.* 443, *papātā ti pabbatantare vā thalantare.*

[3] *VA.* 443 says, "like the blameworthy man who has fallen into defeat, having committed sexual intercourse, and having taken what was not given."

which has been broken in half cannot be put together again,[1] so the monk who has intentionally deprived a human being of life is not a (true) recluse, not a (true) son of the Sakyans,[2] and is therefore called one who is defeated.

Is not in communion means: *communion* is called one work, one rule, an equal training, this is called communion; he who is not together with this is therefore called *not in communion*. || **3** ||

Himself, by volitional force,[3] by a messenger, by a series of messengers, by a special kind of messenger, by a messenger gone and returned again.

Not in secret thinking to be in secret; in secret thinking to be not in secret; not in secret thinking to be not in secret; in secret thinking to be in secret.

He praises by means of the body, he praises by means of the voice, he praises by means of (both) the body and the voice, he praises by means of a messenger, he praises by means of a writing.[4]

A pitfall, a support,[5] a trap, medicine, offering a sight, offering a sound, offering a smell, offering a taste, offering a touch, offering dhamma, announcement, instruction, making a rendezvous,[6] making a sign. || 1 ||

---

[1] This is the only Pārājika where, in the simile, the word *abhabba* does not occur.

[2] *Cf. Vin.* i. 97, where it is said that a monk who has received the upasampadā ordination should not deprive any living being (*pāṇa*) of life, even down to an ant or a worm.

[3] *Adhiṭṭhāya. Adhitiṭṭhati* or *adhiṭṭhahati, adhiṭṭhāti, adhiṭṭheti* is a word of wide meaning. *Tr. Crit. Pali Dict.* includes above passage under "to determine, resolve, wish." *VA.* 445 explains *adhiṭṭhahitvā* by *samīpe ṭhatvā*. On the "volitional force" of *adhiṭṭhāna* consult Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Birth of Indian Psychology*, etc., p. 112. *Adhiṭṭhita* used in connection with robes at *Vin.* iii. 196.

[4] *Lekhāya. Lekhā* means lit. a scratching, therefore a writing. See below, p. 131, n. 1.

[5] *Apassena.*

[6] *Saṁketakamma*, see above, p. 88.

Himself means: he himself kills by means of the body or by something attached to the body or by something that may be cast.

By volitional force means: exerting volitional force, he commands: hit thus, strike thus, kill thus. [74]

A monk commands a monk, saying, "Deprive so-and-so of life," there is an offence of wrong-doing. He, thinking this is the person,[1] deprives him of life, there is an offence involving defeat for both.

A monk commands a monk, saying, "Deprive so-and-so of life," there is an offence of wrong-doing. He, thinking this is the person, deprives another of life, there is no offence for the instigator, there is an offence involving defeat for the murderer.

A monk commands a monk, saying . . . He, thinking of another, deprives a certain person of life, there is an offence involving defeat for both.

A monk commands a monk, saying . . . He, thinking of another, deprives that other of life, there is no offence for the instigator, there is an offence involving defeat for the murderer.

A monk commands a monk saying, "Tell so-and-so, let so-and-so tell so-and-so, let so-and-so deprive so-and-so of life," there is an offence of wrong-doing. The murderer accepts . . . there is a grave offence for the instigator. He deprives him of life . . . there is an offence involving defeat.

A monk commands a monk, saying, "Tell so-and-so, let so-and-so tell so-and-so, let so-and-so deprive so-and-so of life," there is an offence of wrong-doing. He commands another, there is an offence of wrong-doing. The murderer accepts, there is an offence of wrong-doing. He deprives him of life, there is no offence for the instigator, there is an offence involving defeat for the one who gives the orders and for the murderer.

A monk commands a monk, saying, "Deprive so-and-so of life," there is an offence of wrong-doing.

[1] *Taṃ.*

Going, he comes back again, saying, "I am not able to deprive him of life." He commands him again, saying, "If you can, then deprive him of life," there is an offence of wrong-doing. He deprives him of life, there is an offence involving defeat for both.

A monk commands a monk, saying, "Deprive so-and-so of life," there is an offence of wrong-doing. Having commanded, he is remorseful, but does not declare, "Do not kill him." He deprives him of life, there is an offence involving defeat for both.

A monk commands a monk, saying, "Deprive so-and-so of life," there is an offence of wrong-doing. Having commanded, he is remorseful and declares, "Do not kill him." He says, "I am commanded by you," and deprives him of life, there is no offence for the instigator, there is an offence involving defeat for the murderer.

A monk commands a monk, saying . . . Having commanded, he is remorseful and declares, "Do not kill him." He says, "Very well," and desists, there is no offence for either. ||2||

Not in secret thinking to be in secret, he calls out, "If only so-and-so were killed," there is an offence of wrong-doing. *In secret thinking to be not in secret* . . . *Not in secret thinking to be not in secret* . . . [75] *In secret thinking to be in secret* . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing. ||3||

He praises by means of the body means: he makes a gesture with the body,[1] saying, "Whoever dies thus[2] receives wealth or receives glory or goes to heaven," there is an offence of wrong-doing. He says, "On account of this praise I will die," (and) produces a painful feeling, there is a grave offence; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat.

---

[1] *Kāyena vikāraṃ karoti* (*dasseti*, *VA*. 452, with *v.l. karoti*), lit. he makes an (expressive) gesture.

[2] According to *VA*. 452, by taking a sword or by drinking poison, as at p. 127 above.

He praises by means of the voice means: he proclaims by the voice, "Whoever dies thus . . ." . . .; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat.

He praises by means of the body and the voice means: he makes a gesture with the body and proclaims by the voice, "Whoever dies thus . . ." . . .; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat.

He praises by means of a messenger means: He gives instruction to a messenger, saying: "Whoever dies thus receives wealth, or receives glory or goes to heaven" —there is an offence of wrong-doing. Having heard the messenger's instruction, one says: "I will die," and produces a painful feeling, there is a grave offence; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat.

He praises by means of a writing means: he cuts a writing[1] saying, "Whoever dies thus receives wealth

---

[1] *lekhaṃ chindati, VA.* 452, "he cuts syllables (*akkharāni*) on a leaf or a book (*potthake, cf.* Sk. *pustaka*). *Cf. Jā.* ii. 90, *akkharāni chinditvā,* here on a *kaṇḍa,* a stalk or cane. *Lekhaṃ chindati* could not therefore here mean "destroys the letter" as *P.T.S. Dict.* says. *Cf. rūpaṃ chindati* at *VA.* 690 in connection with cutting a figure on the wooden *māsaka. Lekhā* therefore does not necessarily mean writing as we have it to-day. At *Vin.* iv. 7 *lekhā* is one of the three "high crafts" (or occupations, *sippa*). At *Vin.* i. 77=iv. 128 Upāli's parents decide against letting him learn *lekhā* on the grounds that his fingers will become painful. At *Vin.* iv. 305 it is said to be no offence for a nun to learn writing (*lekhaṃ pariyāpuṇāti*). *Lekha* is the writing, the letter; *lekhā* the line, the tracing (*cf. Jā.* vi. 56). *VA.* 867 explains by *akkharāni likhantassa. Cf. VA.* 739 *lekhā ti akkharalekhā,* letters: syllables or letters; see next n. for *akkhara.*

At *Vin.* ii. 110 the context seems to demand another meaning for *lekhā*: it is to be something that can be separated from the bowl; this can be given away, whereas *lekhañ ca me paribhogaṃ bhavissati,* "so that the chips shall remain my property" (*Vin. Texts* iii. 78), or "the chips will come to be for my personal use," or "the chips will be of use to me." (*Paribhoga* is that which one uses, of use, rather than property.) At this passage *lekhaṃ* (which has faulty variant reading *likhaṃ*; *cf. likhāpaṇṇa* for *lekhā°* at *PvA.* 20) is almost certainly to be taken in its meaning of "chips, shavings."

At *A.* i. 283=*Pug.* 32 three kinds of individuals are described: *pāsāṇalekhūpama, pathavilekhūpama, udakalekhūpama.* Here *lekhā* is trans. at *G.S.* i. 262 by "carving." Neither *Comy.* remarks on *lekhā.*

or receives glory or goes to heaven," there is an offence of wrong-doing for each syllable.[1] Having seen the writing he says, "I will die"; he produces a painful feeling, there is a grave offence; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat. || 4 ||

A pitfall means: he digs a pitfall for a man, saying: "Falling into it he will die," there is an offence of wrong-doing. The man falls down into it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. In falling down a painful feeling arises, there is a grave offence; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat. He digs a pitfall without a purpose, and says of whoever falls into it, "He will die," there is an offence of wrong-doing. A man falls down into it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. In falling down a painful feeling arises, there is a grave offence; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat. A yakkha or a departed one or an animal in human form[2] falls down into it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.[3] In falling down a painful feeling arises, there is an offence of wrong-doing; if he dies, there is a grave offence. An animal falls down into it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. In falling down a painful

---

[1] *akkharakkharāya*, or "for the syllables and syllables" so "for each syllable." *Tr. Crit. Pali Dict.* says that *akkhara* is opposed to *pada*, word. *Akkhara* seems to be connected with *akṣara* of the Upaniṣads, the Imperishable—perhaps because the letters when engraved could faintly emulate the Imperishable (Veda).

[2] *Tiracchānagatamanussaviggaha*, lit. a man taking up the form of one going as an animal. This is obviously meant to be something different from *tiracchānagata*, going as an animal, just below. The former probably refers to an animal who has the power to put on human form in this life; for this is a belief which existed at that time. *Cf.* the rule which forbids an animal in human form to be ordained, *Vin.* i. 86, 87. The latter, going as an animal, or just an animal, is a fairly forceful expression in connection with the belief in rebirth, meaning that someone is going as an animal in this rebirth.

[3] *VA.* 455 says, "It was dug for a man, (therefore) he is not guilty of the death of yakkhas and so forth who fall into it." In the Vinaya, yakkhas constantly appear as the denizens of some sphere or other, not far removed from the realm of mankind. The same is true of the petas, or departed ones.

feeling arises, there is an offence of wrong-doing; if he dies there is an offence requiring expiation. || 5 ||

A support means: he puts a dagger in a support, or smears it with poison, or makes it weak, or he arranges it in a deep ravine, or a pit, or a steep precipice, and says: "Falling down, he will die," there is an offence of wrong-doing. A painful feeling arises on account of the dagger or the poison or the fall, there is a grave offence; [**76**] if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat. || 6 ||

A trap means: he secretly deposits a knife or a dagger or an arrow or a cudgel or a stone or a sword or poison or a rope,[1] saying, "Because of this, he will die," there is an offence of wrong-doing. He says, "I will die on account of this," and produces a painful feeling, there is a grave offence; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat. || 7 ||

Medicine means: he gives ghee or fresh butter or oil or honey or molasses,[2] saying, "Having tasted this, he will die," there is an offence of wrong-doing. In tasting it a painful feeling arises, there is a grave offence; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat. || 8 ||

Offering a sight[3] means: he arranges a dreadful sight, saying, "Seeing this frightful, horrible thing, and being terrified he will die," there is an offence of wrong-doing. Seeing it he is terrified, there is an offence; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat. He arranges a lovely sight, saying, "Seeing this and if it fades with-

---

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 126, where these items are grouped together under "should look about so as to be his knife-bringer."

[2] These are the five kinds of medicine, *cf. Vin.* iii. 251.

[3] It is curious that the five senses are all equally powerful here, and that the last three are not grouped together under *muta*, sensed, felt, thought or imagined, as sometimes occurs in the older literature, *e.g. Vin.* iv. 2. It is also curious that these five senses have the power to cause death. Was it really believed that people died because of a bad smell or loud noise?

out his getting it, he will die," there is an offence of wrong-doing. Seeing this, it fades without his getting it, there is a grave offence; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat.

Offering a sound means: he arranges a dreadful sound, saying, "Hearing this frightening, horrible thing, and being terrified, he will die," there is an offence of wrong-doing. Hearing it, he is terrified, there is a grave offence; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat. He arranges a lovely sound, saying, "Hearing this lovely, heart-stirring[1] thing, and if it fades without his getting it, he will die," there is an offence of wrong-doing. Hearing this, it fades without his getting it, there is a grave offence; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat.

Offering a smell means: he arranges a dreadful smell, saying, "Smelling this loathsome, objectionable thing, he will die because it is loathsome and objectionable," there is an offence of wrong-doing. In smelling it a painful feeling arises because it is loathsome and objectionable, there is a grave offence; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat. He arranges a lovely smell, saying, "Smelling this and if it fades without his getting it, he will die," there is an offence of wrong-doing. Smelling this, it fades without his getting it, there is a grave offence; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat.

Offering a taste means: he arranges a dreadful taste, saying, "Tasting this loathsome, objectionable thing, he will die because it is loathsome and objectionable," there is an offence of wrong-doing. In tasting it a painful feeling arises because it is loathsome and objectionable, there is a grave offence; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat. He arranges a lovely taste, saying, "Tasting this, if it fades without his getting it, he will die," there is an offence of wrong-doing. Tasting this, it fades without his getting it, there is a grave offence; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat.

[1] *Hadayaṃgama, cf. D.* i. 4.

Offering a touch means: [77] he arranges a dreadful touch, saying, "This is contact with pain, this is a hard contact, touched by which he will die," there is an offence of wrong-doing. In touching it a painful feeling arises, there is a grave offence; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat. He arranges a lovely touch, saying, "This is a pleasant contact, a soft contact, if touched by this it fades without his getting it, he will die," there is an offence of wrong-doing. Touched by this, it fades without his getting it, there is a grave offence; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat.

Offering dhamma means: he gives talk about hell[1] to one doomed to suffering in hell, saying, "Hearing this, and being terrified, he will die," there is an offence of wrong-doing. Hearing this, he is terrified, there is a grave offence; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat. He gives talk about heaven to a man of good behaviour,[2] saying, "Hearing this, and set upon it,[3] he will die," there is an offence of wrong-doing. Hearing this and set upon it, he says, "I will die," and produces a painful feeling, there is a grave offence; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat. || 9 ||

Announcement means: asked (about it) he says: "Die thus,[4] he who dies thus receives wealth or he receives glory or he goes to heaven," there is an offence of wrong-doing. He says, "On account of this announcement I will die," and produces a painful feeling, there is a grave offence; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat.

Instruction means: not asked (about it) he says: "Die thus, he who dies thus receives wealth, or he receives glory or he goes to heaven," there is an offence of wrong-doing. He says, "On account of this instruction I will die," and produces a painful feeling, there is a grave offence; if he dies, there is an offence involving defeat.

The making of a rendezvous means: he makes a rendezvous, saying: "Before the meal or after the meal

[1] *Niraya.* [2] *Kalyāṇakamma.*
[3] *Adhimutta.* *Cf.* below, p. 148. [4] *Evaṃ marassu.*

or in the night or in the day, on account of this rendezvous deprive him of life," there is an offence of wrong-doing. On account of this rendezvous he deprives him of life, there is an offence involving defeat for both. He deprives him of life before or after the rendezvous, there is no offence for the instigator, but there is an offence involving defeat for the murderer.

The making of a sign means: he makes a sign, saying: "I will cover the eye or I will raise the eyebrow or I will raise the head; at that sign[1] deprive him of life," there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he deprives him of life before or after that sign, there is no offence for the instigator, there is an offence involving defeat for the murderer. || 10 ||

There is no offence if it was unintentional, if he did not know, if he were not meaning death, if he was out of his mind, a beginner. || 11 || **4** ||

Told is the First Recital: that on Defeat connected with human beings [**78**]

Praising, sitting down, and about pestles and mortars,
Gone forth when old,[2] a falling out,[3] first (-taste),[4]
experimental poison, /

---

[1] =*p*. 89, above.

[2] *vuḍḍhapabbajitā*, usually "those long gone forth, old monks."

[3] Oldenberg, *Vin.* iii. 271 f. gives *v.ll. vuḍḍhapabbajitā ca bhisanno*, °*jitā sinno*, and "°*jjitassa no* corrected to °*jjitâbhisanno*," and he says, "I do not know how to correct *bhisanno* or *sinno*." The final *ā* of °*jjitā* may possibly belong to *bhissanno*, then=*abhisanno*, meaning "full of, overflowing with" (old monks, **5**, 4), or a "falling out" (of meat, **5**, 5). *Sinna* as p.p. of *sijjati* usually means "wet with perspiration, boiled," but it cannot mean that here. The word does not appear again in the stories below. Possibly one group has been omitted.

[4] Text reads *aggaṃ*. Oldenberg proposed an emendation to *laggaṃ*, doubtless thinking of *vilagga* in **5**, 5, but *aggaṃ* refers to *agga* (-*kārika*) of **5**, 6.

Three about making sites, then three on bricks,
An adze, and then a beam, a platform, descent, he fell,/
And heating, nose (-treatment), rubbing, on bathing and about oil,
Making get up, making lie down,[1] dying because of food and drink,/
Child by a lover, and co-wives, he killed both mother and child,
Neither die,[2] destroying, scorching, barren, fruitful,/
Nudging, restraints, a yakkha, and he sent to a predatory yakkha,
Thinking about him, he dealt a blow,[3] and heaven, a talk on hell,/
Three on trees at Āḷavī, then three about fires,
Do not keep in misery, not yours, and on buttermilk and sour gruel./

Now at that time a certain monk was ill. Out of compassion the monks praised the beauty of death to him, and that monk died. They were remorseful, and said: "What now if we have fallen into an offence involving defeat?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said: "You, monks, have fallen into an offence involving defeat." || 1 ||

At one time a certain monk who was going for alms, sat down on a boy who was on a chair concealed by a rag, and sitting (hard)[4] on him, killed him. He was

[1] Text, *maranaṃ*.
[2] *ubho na miyyare. Cf. na miyyare* at *Sn.* 575.
[3] *pahari*.
[4] *ottharitvā*; this word occurs again below in the next par. and also at p. 146, below. *VA.* 475 on this latter passage explains by *akkamitvā*, and goes on to say that a monk having fallen down was dragged along by some others, and one having got on to his stomach sat there. But *cf.* p. 59, n. 1, above for *akkamitvā*, meaning "kicking, making a kick at." At *Miln.* 121 *ottharati* is used in connection with the waves of the sea: they "flow" (so trans. *S.B.E.* xxxi. 182), meaning they flow again over the spot whence

remorseful. . . . "Monks, there is no offence involving defeat. But monks should not sit down on a seat without noticing (what they are doing). Whoever shall so sit down—there is an offence of wrong-doing." ‖ 2 ‖

Now at that time a certain monk who was preparing a seat in the refectory inside a house, took hold of a pestle, the pestles being high up, when a second pestle falling down, hit[1] the head of a certain boy (hard); he died. The monk was remorseful. . . . "Of what were you thinking, monk?" he said.

"I did not intend it, lord," he said.

"There is no offence, monk, as it was not intentional," he said.

At one time a certain monk who was preparing a seat in a refectory inside a house, treading on the mortar-requisites,[2] knocked it over[3]; hitting[4] a certain boy (hard), it killed him. He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence, monk, as it was not intentional." ‖ 3 ‖

Now at that time a father and son were going forth among the monks. When the time was announced[5] the son said to his father: "Go, honoured sir, the Order

---

they had rolled back. It there has the sense of covering over or covering up. *P.T.S. Dict.* under *ottharati* says, "see also *avattharati*" for both of which it gives much the same meanings. I think it possible that *ottharati* (as here and in next par. below, and again below at p. 146) and *avattharati* as at next note below, have the sense of dealing roughly with someone, even by mistake. *Avatthāsi* occurs again, p. 140, where it also seems as if it means "hit" (with loc.). Both words certainly seem to include the sense of *hard*, sitting hard enough or hitting hard enough to cause death.

[1] *avatthāsi.*

[2] *bhaṇḍikā.* This is a comprehensive word meaning a heap of goods, a collection. At *Jā.* iii. 41 it is *v.l.* for *gaṇḍikā*, which as "executioner's block" could not make sense here. "Mortar-requisites" would include the pestle.

[3] *akkamitvā pavaṭṭesi.* *Akkamitvā* here seems to be in its meaning of "to tread on." We get the same expression in *Vin.* iii. 38, above, p. 59, where it seems to mean "rising, he knocked her over," and I should like to add *hard*, rising hard or suddenly. See above, p. 137, n. 4.

[4] *ottharitvā*, see above, p. 137, n. 4.

[5] *kāle ārocite.*

waits for you," and seizing him by the back, he pushed him away. Falling down, he died. He was remorseful. . . . [79] "Of what were you thinking, monk?" he said.

"I did not mean (to cause his) death, lord," he said.

"There is no offence, monk, since you did not mean (to cause his) death," he said.

Now at that time a father and son were going forth among the monks. When the time was announced[1] the son said to his father: "Go, honoured sir, the Order waits for you," and meaning to cause his death he seized him by the back and pushed him away. Falling down, he died. He was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat," he said.

Now at one time a father and son were going forth among the monks. When the time was announced the son said to his father: "Go, honoured sir, the Order waits for you," and meaning to cause his death he seized him by the back and pushed him away. Falling down, he did not die. He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence, monk, involving defeat, there is a grave offence." || 4 ||

At one time while a certain monk was eating, some meat[2] stuck in his throat. A certain monk gave a blow to that monk's neck; the meat fell out with blood, and that monk died. He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence, monk, as you did not mean to cause his death."

At one time while a certain monk was eating, some meat stuck in his throat. A certain monk, meaning to cause his death, gave a blow to that monk's neck; the meat fell out with blood, and that monk died. He was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat."

At one time while a certain monk was eating, some meat stuck in his throat. A certain monk, meaning to cause his death, gave a blow to that monk's neck.

---

[1] *kāle ārocite.*

[2] *maŋsa*; again showing that the monks were not vegetarians. *Cf.* above, p. 98.

The meat fell out with blood, but that monk did not die. He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence involving defeat, monk; there is a grave offence." || 5 ||

At one time a certain monk who was on his alms-round, receiving poisoned alms-food and bringing it back, on his return gave a first-taste to the monks. These died. He was remorseful. . . . "Of what were you thinking, monk?" he said.

"I did not know, lord," he said.

"There is no offence, monk, since you did not know," he said.

At one time a certain monk gave poison to a certain monk, intending to test it. This monk died. He was remorseful. . . . "Of what were you thinking, monk?" he said.

"I intended to test it, lord," he said.

"There is no offence involving defeat, monk; there is a grave offence," he said. || 6 ||

At one time the monks of Āḷavī were making a site for a vihāra. [80] A certain monk being below, lifted up his head, and a stone badly held by a monk who was above, hit[1] the monk who was below on the head, and that monk died. He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence, monk, as it was unintentional," he said.

At one time the monks of Āḷavī were making a site for a vihāra. A certain monk being below, lifted up a stone. A monk who was above, intending to kill the one who was below, let loose the stone at his head. That monk died . . . that monk did not die. He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence involving defeat, monk; there is a grave offence," he said. || 7 ||

At one time the monks of Āḷavī were erecting a wall[2] for the vihāra. A certain monk, being below, lifted

---

[1] *avatthāsi*, *cf.* above, p. 137, n. 4.

[2] *Kuḍḍa.* At *Vin.* iv. 266 three kinds of walls are mentioned: *iṭṭhakā°* (of tiles or bricks, as here), *silā°* (of stones), *dāru°* (of wood).

up a burnt brick, and the burnt brick being badly held by a monk who was above, fell on the head of the monk who was below. He died. He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence, monk, since it was unintentional."

At one time the monks of Āḷavī were erecting a wall for the vihāra. A certain monk, being below, lifted up a burnt brick. A monk who was above, intending to cause the death of the monk who was below, let loose the burnt brick at his head. That monk died . . . that monk did not die. He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence involving defeat, monk, but there is a grave offence." || 8 ||

At one time the monks of Āḷavī were making repairs. A certain monk, being below, lifted up an adze. The adze being badly held by a monk who was above, fell on the head of the monk who was below. That monk died. He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence, monk, since it was unintentional," he said.

At one time the monks of Āḷavī were making repairs . . . lifted up an adze. A monk who was above, meaning to cause the death of the monk who was below, let loose the adze at his head. That monk died . . . that monk did not die. . . . He was remorseful. . . . ". . . grave offence," he said. || 9 ||

At one time the monks of Āḷavī were making repairs. A certain monk, being below, lifted up a beam. The beam being badly held by a monk who was above . . . (*three cases as above*) . . . ". . . grave offence," he said. || 10 ||

At one time the monks of Āḷavī, making repairs, were fixing up a platform.[1] A certain monk said to another monk: "Your reverence, fix it standing here." He stood there and, in fixing it, he fell down and died.

[1] *Aṭṭaka.* *VA.* 466 calls it *vehāsamañca,* lit. a bed above the ground, probably a platform or scaffold up a tree, such as hunters use. It is the diminutive of *aṭṭa,* a watch-tower, *Vin.* iii. 200.

[81] He was remorseful. . . . "Of what were you thinking, monk?" he said.

"I did not mean to cause his death, lord," he said.

"There is no offence, monk, since you did not mean to cause his death," he said.

At one time the monks of Āḷavī, making repairs, were fixing up a platform. A certain monk, meaning to cause (his) death, said to another monk: "Your reverence, fix it standing here." He stood there and, in fixing it, fell down and died . . . fell down and did not die. He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence involving defeat, monk, there is a grave offence," he said. || 11 ||

At one time a certain monk, having thatched a vihāra, was coming down. A certain monk said to that monk: "Your reverence, come down here." Coming down at that place and falling down, he died. He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence, monk, since you did not mean to cause his death," he said.

At one time a certain monk, having thatched a vihāra, was coming down. A certain monk, meaning to cause his death, said to that monk: "Your reverence, come down here." Coming down at that place, he fell down and died . . . fell down and did not die. . . . "There is no offence involving defeat, monk, there is a grave offence," he said. || 12 ||

At one time a certain monk, tormented by chafing, having scaled the Vulture's Peak, falling down the precipice, and hitting a certain basket-maker hard, killed him. He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence involving defeat, monk. But, monks, one should not throw oneself off. Whoever shall throw (himself) off, there is an offence of wrong-doing," he said.

At one time the group of six monks, having scaled the Vulture's Peak, threw down a stone in fun. Hitting a certain cowherd (hard), it[1] killed him. They were

[1] *mārensuṃ.* We should say "it" (the stone), but the Pali regards the men as the agents of the cowherd's death.

remorseful. . . . "There is no offence involving defeat, monks. But, monks, you should not throw down a stone in fun. Whoever shall so throw one down, there is an offence of wrong-doing," he said. || 13 ||

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks heated him, and he died. They were remorseful. . . . "There is no offence, monks, since you did not mean to cause his death," he said.

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks heated him, meaning to cause his death. This monk died . . . this monk did not die. They were remorseful. . . . "There is no offence involving defeat, monks, there is a grave offence," he said. || 14 ||

At one [82] time a certain monk had a headache.[1] The monks gave him medical treatment through the nose.[2] This monk died. They were remorseful. . . . "There is no offence involving defeat, monks, since you did not mean to cause his death," he said.

At one time a certain monk had a headache. The monks, meaning to cause his death, gave him medical treatment through the nose. This monk died . . . did not die. They were remorseful. . . . "There is no offence involving defeat, monks, there is a grave offence," he said. || 15 ||

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks rubbed him. This monk died . . . (*three cases as above*). . . . "There is a grave offence," he said.

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks bathed him. This monk died . . . "There is a grave offence," he said.

---

[1] *sīsâbhitāpa*, lit. "heat in the head," *cf. Vin.* i. 204, where Pilindavaccha is mentioned as suffering this ailment.

[2] *natthuṃ adaṃsu*=*natthukamma* as at *Vin.* i. 204. *DA.* i. 98, expl. *telaṃ yojetvā n° karaṇam.* At *D.* i. 12 this treatment is included among the low arts by which some samaṇas and brahmins earn a wrong livelihood, but at *Vin.* i. 204 it is allowed by Gotama, with details of how best to apply the drug to be taken through the nose. *Cf. DhA.* i. 12.

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks anointed him with oil. This monk died. . . . "There is a grave offence," he said.

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks made him get up.[1] This monk died. . . . "There is a grave offence," he said.

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks made him lie down. This monk died. . . . "There is a grave offence," he said.

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks gave him food . . . they gave him drink. This monk died. . . . "There is a grave offence," he said. || 16 ||

At one time a certain woman whose husband was living away from home became with child by a lover. She said to a monk who was dependent for alms on (her) family: "Look here, master, find me an abortive preparation."

"All right, sister," he said, and he gave her an abortive preparation. The child died. He was remorseful. . . . "You, monk, have fallen into an offence involving defeat," he said. || 17 ||

At one time a certain man had two wives: one was barren, and one was fertile. The barren woman said to the monk who was dependent for alms on (her) family: "If she should bring forth (a child), honoured sir, she will become mistress of the whole establishment. Look here, master, find an abortive preparation for her."

"All right, sister," he said, and he gave her an abortive preparation. The child died, but the mother did not die. He was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat," he said.

At one time a certain man had two wives . . . he gave her an abortive preparation. The mother died, but the child did not die. He was remorseful . . . "There is no offence involving defeat, monk, [83] there is a grave offence," he said.

[1] Or, "raised him" (to a sitting position).

At one time a certain man had two wives . . . he gave her an abortive preparation. Both died . . . neither died. He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence involving defeat, monk; there is a grave offence," he said. || 18 ||

At one time a certain woman who was pregnant, said to a monk who was dependent for alms on (her) family: "Look here, master, find me an abortive preparation."

"Well then, destroy[1] it, sister," he said. She, having destroyed it, caused abortion. He was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat," he said.

At one time a certain woman who was pregnant . . . "Well then, scorch yourself, sister," he said. She, scorching herself, caused abortion. He was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat," he said. || 19 ||

At one time a certain barren woman said to a monk who was dependent for alms on (her) family: "Look here, master, find some medicine by which I may become fertile."

"All right, sister," he said, and gave her some medicine. She died. He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence involving defeat, monk; there is an offence of wrong-doing," he said. || 20 ||

At one time a certain fertile woman said to a monk who was dependent for alms on (her) family: "Look here, master, find some medicine by which I may not become fertile."

"All right, sister," he said . . . "there is an offence of wrong-doing," he said. || 21 ||

At one time the group of six monks made one of the group of seventeen monks[2] laugh by tickling him with

[1] *maddassu*, crush, bruise. *Cf. Jā.* iii. 121.

[2] *Cf. Vin.* iv. 110, where this story also appears; tickling with the fingers is there said to be a pācittiya offence. The seventeen monks are also mentioned at *Vin.* iv. 41. At *Vin.* i. 77=iv. 128, the boy Upāli is said to have seventeen friends. See Intr. p. xxxvi, n. 2.

their fingers. This monk, faint and unable to get his breath, died. They were remorseful. . . . "There is no offence involving defeat, monks," he said. ||22||

At one time the group of seventeen monks said to one of the group of six monks: "We will do some work,"[1] and treading on him,[2] they killed him. They were remorseful. . . . "There is no offence involving defeat, monks," he said. ||23||

At one time a certain monk who was an exorcist[3] deprived a yakkha of life. He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence involving defeat, monk, there is a grave offence,"[4] he said. ||24||

At one time a certain monk sent a certain monk to a vihāra inhabited by a predatory yakkha.[5] The yakkhas deprived him of life. He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence, monk, as you did not mean to cause his death," he said.

At one time a certain monk, meaning to cause his death, sent a certain monk to a vihāra inhabited by a predatory yakkha. The yakkhas deprived him of

---

[1] *kammaṃ karissāma*, possibly idiomatic, "we will do (for him)," "we will have some fun."

[2] *ottharitvā=akkamitvā*, *VA.* 475. See above, p. 137.

[3] *bhūtavejjaka*; *bhūtavijjā* mentioned at *D.* i. 9 as a "low art." *Bhūtavidyā* (trans. by R. E. Hume as "Demonology") also occurs at Chānd. 7.2.1.=7.7.1.

[4] The monk learned in exorcism, in freeing a person possessed by a yakkha may cut off a clay doll's head; then the yakkha dies, killed by him. But he may kill not only the yakkha but Sakka, king of the Devas; therefore it is a grave offence. *VA.* 475. At *S.* i. 206 some Sakka is called a *yakkha*. *K.S.* i. 263, n. 3 says, "there is no tradition, revealed in the *Comy.* that Sakka, ruler of the Thirty[-three] Gods, is meant." He was a (*eko*) yakkha belonging to Māra's faction, *SA.* i. 302.

[5] *vāḷayakkha*. *VA.* 475, "In this vihāra a predatory (*vāḷa*), fierce yakkha dwelt; it was his vihāra." At *A.* iii. 256 *vāḷayakkhas* are said to be one of the five dangers of Madhurā. See *G.S.* iii. 188, n. 3. Mr. E. M. Hare translates *vāḷayakkhā* as "bestial yakkhas." *Cf.* yakkha eating men and cattle at *D.* ii. 346. Term may mean "yakkha in form of a beast of prey."

life . . . the yakkhas did not deprive him of life. . . . "There is no offence involving defeat, monk, (but) there is a grave offence," he said. || 25 || [84]

At one time a certain monk sent a certain monk to wilds inhabited by beasts of prey[1] . . . to wilds inhabited by robbers. The beasts of prey . . . the robbers . . . deprived him of life. He was remorseful . . . (*three cases each time as above*). . . . "There is a grave offence," he said. || 26 ||

At one time a certain monk, thinking of a certain person, deprived him of life . . . thinking of a certain person, deprived another of life . . . thinking of another, deprived a certain person of life, thinking of another, deprived (that) other of life. He was remorseful. . . . ". . . defeat," he said. || 27 ||

At one time a certain monk was seized by a non-human being.[2] A certain monk gave that monk a blow.[3] He died. He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence, monk, since you did not mean to cause his death," he said.

At one time a certain monk was seized by a non-human being. A certain monk, meaning to cause his death, gave that monk a blow. That monk died . . . that monk did not die. He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence involving defeat, monk, there is a grave offence," he said. || 28 ||

---

[1] *VA.* 476: "In all of these wilds there are beasts of prey and snakes . . . in all of those there are robbers." Five kinds of wilds (*kantāra*) mentioned at *Jā.* i. 99, *SA.* i. 324; four kinds at *Nd.* ii. 630.

[2] *amanussena*: *amanussa* is a yakkha, a spirit, a ghost. At *Vin.* i. 277 it is said that Kāka, a slave, was born *amanussena.* Word occurs at *D.* i. 116, *S.* i. 91, and also above, p. 74. *VA.* 298 says, they are either yakkhas or men who, having departed, desire to return.

[3] *VA.* 476 "saying, 'I will drive the yakkha away,' he gives him (*i.e.*, the monk) a blow. One should not give a person possessed by a yakkha a blow, but should bind a palm-leaf or protecting thread on his arm or leg."

At one time a certain monk gave a talk about heaven to a man of good actions. He was set on it,[1] and died. He was remorseful. . . . "There is no offence, monk, since you did not mean to cause his death," he said.

At one time a certain monk, meaning to cause his death, gave a talk about heaven to a man of good actions. He was set on it, and died . . . he was set on it, but did not die. . . . "There is no offence involving defeat, monk, there is a grave offence," he said.

At one time a certain monk gave a talk about hell to a man doomed to suffering in hell. Being terrified, he died . . . (*the same three cases*) . . . "There is a grave offence," he said. ||29||

At one time the monks of Āḷavī were making repairs and felling a tree. A certain monk said to another monk: "Your reverence, fell it standing here." While he was standing there and cutting it, the tree falling (over him) killed him . . . (*three cases*) . . . "There is a grave offence," he said. ||30||

At one time the group of six monks set fire to a forest. Some men were burnt and died . . . (*three cases*) . . . "There is a grave offence," he said. ||31|| [85]

At one time a certain monk, having gone to the place of execution, said to the executioner: "Reverend sir, do not keep him in misery.[2] By one blow deprive him of life."

"All right, honoured sir," he said, and by one blow he deprived him of life. He was remorseful. "You, monk, have fallen into an offence involving defeat," he said.

At one time a certain monk, having gone to the place of execution, said to the executioner: "Reverend sir, do not keep him in misery. By one blow deprive him of life."

---

[1] *adhimutto. Tr. Crit. Pali Dict.*, referring to this passage says, "impressed with the idea." *Cf.* above, p. 135.

[2] *mā yimaṃ kilamesi.*

"I will not do your bidding," he said, (but) deprived him of life. He was remorseful. . . . "Monk, there is no offence involving defeat, there is an offence of wrong-doing,"[1] he said. ||32||

At one time a certain man whose hands and feet had been cut off, was in the paternal home surrounded by relations. A certain monk said to these people, "Reverend sirs, do you desire his death?"

"Indeed, honoured sir, we do desire it," they said.

"Then you should make him drink buttermilk,"[2] he said. They made him drink buttermilk, and he died. He was remorseful. . . . "You, monk, have fallen into an offence involving defeat," he said.

At one time a certain man whose hands and feet had been cut off was in a clansman's house, surrounded by relations. A certain nun said to these people, "Reverend sirs, do you desire his death?"

"Indeed, madam, we do desire it," they said.

"Then you should make him drink salted sour gruel,"[3] she said. They made him drink salted sour gruel, and he died. She was remorseful. Then this

---

[1] Apparently not a grave offence because the executioner was not influenced by the monk's words. The monk only transgressed in uttering the words, attempting to hasten the man's death.

[2] *takka*. *VA*. 478, "buttermilk of a cow, a buffalo, a goat, hot, cold, flavoured or unflavoured." At *Vin*. i. 244 it is included in the five products of the cow (*pañca gorasā*).

[3] *loṇasuvīraka*. *VA*. 478, "a medicine made of all tastes." Bu. gives a long description of the things mixed together to form it: various kinds of myrobalan (astringent and intoxicant), all the seven grains and pulses, gruel, the fruit of the plantain, and all fruits, the jungle creeper, sprouts of various trees, fish and meat, honey and molasses, rock-salt, alkaline and bitter medicines. Then, letting it mature for two or three years, it is the colour of the juice of the rose-apple and is good for various diseases (mentioned here, *cf*. also *A*. v. 110), but further than that (*ca uttaraṃ*) if decaying, it is no longer a medicine. At *Vin*. i. 210 it is called *sovīraka*: here the lord allows the use of it to one who is sick, and to one who is not sick the use of it mixed with water as a medicine.

nun told this matter to the nuns, the nuns told this matter to the monks, and the monks told this matter to the lord. He said, " Monks, this nun has fallen into an offence involving defeat." || 33 || **5** ||

Told is the Third Offence involving Defeat [**86**]

DEFEAT (PĀRĀJIKA) IV

At one time[1] the enlightened one, the lord, was staying in Vesālī in the pavilion of the Gabled Hall in the Great Wood. Now at that time many monks who were friends and companions went for the rains to the banks of the river Vaggumudā.[2] At that time Vajjī was short of alms-food[3] which was difficult to obtain; it was suffering from a famine, and food-tickets were being issued. Nor was it easy to keep oneself going by gleaning or by favour. Then these monks said to one another:

"At present Vajjī is short of alms-food, which is difficult to obtain; it is suffering from a famine, and food-tickets are being issued. Nor is it easy to keep oneself going by gleaning or by favour. What now if we, by some stratagem, and all together, being on friendly terms and harmonious, should spend a comfortable rainy season and should not go short of alms-food?"

Some spoke thus: "Look, your reverences, we could superintend the business of householders, thus they will think to give to us; thus we, all together, being on friendly terms and harmonious, will spend a comfortable rainy season and will not go short of alms-food."

Some spoke thus: "Enough, your reverences, of superintending the business of householders. Look, your reverences, we will execute householders' commis-

[1] From here to towards the end of || 2 || below, *cf. Vin.* iv. 23-25, where it is a pācittiya for a monk to tell of his knowledge of conditions belonging to the further-men, even if he possessed this knowledge. If he does not possess it, it is a pārājika offence to speak of it, as here at Defeat IV.

[2] Mentioned at *Ud.* 25; it is also here said that some monks spent vassa on its banks.

[3] *Cf.* above, Defeat I. 2, 1; 5, 5.

sions,[1] thus they will think to give to us; thus we, all together, being on friendly terms and harmonious, will spend a comfortable rains and will not go short of alms-food."

Some spoke thus: "Enough, your reverences, of superintending the business of householders and of executing householders' commissions. Look, your reverences, we will speak praise to householders concerning this or that state of further-men,[2] saying: 'Such a monk is possessed of the first musing, such a monk is possessed of the second musing, such a monk is possessed of the third musing, such a monk is possessed of the fourth musing, such a monk is a stream-attainer, such a monk is a once-returner, such a monk is a non-returner, such a monk is man perfected, such a monk is a three-fold wisdom man,[3] such a monk is a sixfold super-knowledge man.'[4] Thus these (householders) will think to give to us; thus we, all together, [87] being on friendly terms and harmonious, will spend a comfortable rains and will not go short of alms-food. Just this is better, your reverences: the praise spoken by us to the householders concerning this or that state of further-men."

Then these monks spoke praise to the householders concerning this or that state of further-men, saying: "Such a monk is possessed of the first musing . . . such a monk is a sixfold super-knowledge man." These men thought: "We have gained, surely there is a profit for us that such monks have come for the rains; surely such monks as these monks, virtuous

[1] *dūteyyaṃ harāma.*

[2] *uttarimanussadhammā*, on this term, see Intr., xxiv *f.*

[3] *tevijjo*—*i.e.*, he has knowledge of his own previous rebirths, of the arising and passing away of beings, and of the destruction of the cankers. It is a term handed down from the Upaniṣads, where it meant knowledge of the three Vedas.

[4] *chaḷabhiñño*—*i.e.*, psychic power, clairaudience, knowledge of the thoughts of other beings, knowledge of previous rebirths, clairvoyance, and knowledge of destruction of the cankers. *Cf. A.* iii. 15; *D.* i. 77 ff.; and see *G.S.* iii. Intr. viii for these being originally five.

and of good character, never came to us for the rains before." Accordingly these did not on their own account eat soft food—they gave not to parents, they gave not to wife and children, they gave not to slave or servant, they gave not to friend or colleague, they gave not to blood-relations, as they gave to the monks. Accordingly these did not on their own account take[1] savoury hard foods or drinks—they gave not to parents, they gave not to wife and children, they gave not to slave or servant, they gave not to friend or colleague, they gave not to blood-relations, as they gave to the monks. Thus these monks were handsome, of rounded features, their complexions bright, their skins clear.[2] || 1 ||

Now it was the custom for[3] monks who had finished keeping the rains to go and see the lord. Then these monks who had finished keeping the rains, the three months having elapsed, packed away their bedding,[4] and taking their bowls and robes, went up to Vesālī. In the course of time they came up to Vesālī, the Great Wood, the pavilion of the Gabled Hall, and to the lord, and having approached the lord they greeted him and sat down to one side. At that time the monks who had spent the rains in those regions were lean, wretched, of a bad colour,[5] having become very

---

[1] *khādaniyāni sāyaniyāni pāṇāni attanā pivanti. Vin.* iii. 272 gives *v.l.* which before *pivanti* inserts *khādanti sāyanti*, so that trans. might run "eat hard foods, taste savoury foods or take (drink) drinks."

[2] A stock phrase.

[3] For the beginning of this par. *cf. Vin.* i. 158.

[4] *senāsanaṃ saṃsāmetvā*, trans. at *Vin. Texts* i. 326, "set their places of rest in order." I closely follow Chalmers' "packed away their bedding" at *Fur. Dial.* i. 104, because I prefer "away" rather than "up" which suggests the possibility of their taking their bedding with them when vassa was over. "Places of rest" is, I think, misleading: much teaching of the laity went on during vassa, which could therefore only be regarded as a time of leisure in so far as there was no travelling from vihāra to vihāra.

[5] This is all stock-phrase. *Dubbaṇṇa*: Chalmers at *Fur. Dial.* ii. 65 trans. "ill-looking," while at *Vin. Texts* i. 186 it is trans. "discoloured."

yellow,[1] their veins standing out all over their bodies,[2] but the monks from the banks of the Vaggumudā were handsome, of rounded features, their complexions bright, their skins clear. It was the custom for enlightened ones, for lords, to exchange friendly greetings with incoming monks.[3] So the lord said to the monks from the banks of the Vaggumudā:

"I hope, monks, that things went well with you,[4] I hope that you had enough to support your life, I hope that, in unity, being on friendly terms and harmonious, you spent a comfortable rainy season and did not go short of alms-food?"

"Things did go well with us, lord,[5] we had sufficient to support life, lord,[5] and in unity we, lord,[6] being on friendly terms and harmonious, spent a comfortable rainy season and did not go short of alms-food."

Tathāgatas knowing (sometimes) ask; [88] knowing (sometimes) do not ask . . . enlightened ones, lords, put questions to the monks for two purposes, saying: "Shall we give dhamma, or shall we make known the course of training for disciples?"[7] Then the lord said to the monks from the banks of the Vaggumudā:

"In what way did you, monks, being in unity and on friendly terms and harmonious, spend a comfortable rainy season and not go short of alms-food?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord.

"Indeed, monks, I wonder if that is true?"[8]

"It is a falsehood, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "It is unsuitable, foolish men, it is not becoming,

---

[1] *uppaṇḍuppaṇḍukajāta*, Chalmers, *loc. cit.*, "jaundiced," and *Vin. Texts* i. 186, "(. . . his complexion has become) more and more yellow."

[2] *dhamanisanthatagatta*, Chalmers, *loc. cit.*, "their veins standing out like whipcord."

[3] =*Vin.* i. 59=212=253.

[4] =*Vin.* i. 59=212=253. *Kacci khamanīyaṃ*, *cf. Vin.* i. 204, 205, where *na kkhamanīyo hoti* is used of a disease which had not become better.

[5] *Bhagavā.*

[6] *Bhante.*

[7] =*Vin.* i. 158=iii. 6.

[8] *Kacci pana vo bhūtan ti.*

it is not proper, it is not fitting for a recluse, it is unlawful, it is not to be done. How can you, foolish men, for the sake of your stomachs, speak praise to householders concerning this or that state of further-men? It would be better for you, foolish men, that your bellies should be cut open with a sharp butcher's knife, than that you, for the sake of your stomachs, should speak praise to householders concerning this or that state of further-men. What is the cause of this? For *that* reason, foolish men, you may incur death, or suffering like unto death, but not on that account would you, at the breaking up of the body after death, pass to the waste, the bad bourn, the abyss, hell. But for *this* reason, foolish men, at the breaking up of the body after death, you would pass to the waste, the bad bourn, the abyss, hell.[1] Foolish men, this is not for the benefit of non-believers . . ." and having thus rebuked them and given dhamma talk, he addressed the monks: ||2||

"Monks, there are these five great thieves to be found in the world.[2] What are the five? Monks, here[3] a certain one of the great thieves thought: 'To be sure, will I, surrounded by a hundred or by a thousand, wander about among villages, towns, and the possessions of kings, slaying and causing to be slain, destroying and causing destruction, tormenting and causing torment.' He, in the course of time, surrounded by a hundred or by a thousand wanders about among villages, towns, and the possessions of kings, slaying and causing to be slain, destroying and causing destruction, tormenting and causing torment. Now indeed, monks, a certain depraved monk thought: 'To be sure, I, surrounded by a hundred or by a thousand, will make an alms-tour among villages, towns and the possessions of kings, honoured, respected, revered, worshipped, esteemed, supported by householders, by those

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 36.
[2] *Cf. A.* i. 153; iii. 128.
[3] *idhâ ti imasmiŋ sattaloke, VA.* 482.

who have gone forth into homelessness, and by the requisites of robes, alms, bedding and medicine.' He, in the course of time, surrounded by a hundred, by a thousand, made an alms-tour among villages, towns and the possessions of kings, honoured, respected, revered, worshipped, [89] esteemed, supported by householders and receiving the requisites of robes, alms, bedding and medicine for those who go forth into homelessness. This, monks, is the first great thief found existing in the world.

Again, monks, here a certain depraved monk, having mastered thoroughly dhamma and the discipline made known by the tathāgata, takes it for his own. This, monks, is the second great thief found existing in the world.

Again, monks, here a certain depraved monk, blames a follower of the pure Brahma-life, one leading the absolutely pure Brahma-life, for an unfounded breach of the Brahma-life.[1] This, monks, is the third great thief found existing in the world.

Again, monks, a certain depraved monk favours and cajoles a householder on account of those things which are important possessions of the Order, on account of those things which are its important requisites, that is to say, a park, a site for a park, a vihāra, a site for a vihāra, a couch, a chair, a bolster, a pillow, a brass vessel, a brass jar, a brass pot, a brass receptacle, a razor, an axe, a hatchet, a hoe, a spade, a creeper, bamboo, muñja-grass, babbaja-grass, tiṇa-grass, clay, wooden articles, earthenware articles.[2] This, monks, is the fourth great thief found existing in the world.

---

[1] *VA*. 484 says, *suddhañ ca brahmacāriṃ* is a monk whose cankers are destroyed. *Parisuddhaṃ brahmacariyaṃ carantan* means lead- the best (highest) life free from the kilesas. . . . *Amūlakena abrahmacariyena anuddhaṃseti*, means he censures and blames this man for a pārājika offence.

[2] At *Vin*. ii. 170 all these items are grouped into five categories of things which are not transferable by the Order or by a group or by an individual. At *Vin*. ii. 122 a brass pot is one of the three kinds of water-vessels allowed. At *Vin*. ii. 143 all kinds of brass-ware are allowed to the Order except weapons, all kinds of wooden

Monks, in the world with the devas and including Māra, including the Brahmā-world, including recluses and brahmins, including breathing things, including devas and men, this is the chief great thief: he who claims a non-existent[1] state of further-men, which has not become.[2] What is the reason for this? Monks, you have eaten the country's almsfood by theft."

Whoever should declare himself otherwise, otherwise than he is,
Has eaten this by theft, as a gambler by cheating,
Many[3] about whose neck is yellow robe,
Of evil qualities and uncontrolled,
Wicked, by wicked deeds, in hell they're born.
Better it were to eat an iron ball,
Heated and like a (very) sheaf of fire,
Than were a man immoral, uncontrolled,
To make his meals off (the whole) country's alms.

Then the lord having rebuked in various ways the monks from the banks of the Vaggumudā that they were difficult to maintain, difficult to support . . . " . . . And thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should boast, with reference to himself, of a state of further-men, sufficient ariyan knowledge

---

articles except divans (*Vin.* i. 192), long-armed chairs (*Vin.* i. 192), bowls (*Vin.* ii. 112) and shoes (*Vin.* i. 188); all kinds of earthenware except *katakas* (foot scrubbers, see *Vin. Texts* iii. 130, n. 3), and large earthen vessels to be used as huts to live in. See *Vin. Texts* iii. 156 for these references. This last item is the only one not mentioned in previous rules. At *Vin.* ii. 211 injunctions are given to monks setting out on a journey as to what to do with their wooden and earthenware articles. At *Vin.* i. 190 it is a dukkaṭa offence for monks to make foot coverings of tiṇa-, muñja- or babbaja-grass.

[1] *Asanta.* [2] *Abhūta.*

[3] From here to end of verses=*Dhp.* 307, 308=*It.*, p. 43=p. 90 (last three lines only at *It.* 90). I follow Mrs. Rhys Davids' trans. at *S.B.B.* vii.

and insight,[1] though not knowing it fully, saying: 'this I know, this I see'; then not long afterwards, he, being pressed or not being pressed, fallen,[2] should desire to be purified and should say: 'Your reverence, I said that I know what I do not know, [90] see what I do not see, I spoke idly, falsely, vainly,' then he also is one who is defeated, he is not in communion."

Thus this course of training for monks was made known by the lord. ||3||1||

Now at that time a great company of monks, thinking they had seen what they had not seen, attained what they had not attained, found what they had not found, realised what they had not realised, spoke of profound knowledge[3] with undue estimate of themselves.[4] Their heart, not long afterwards, yielded[5] to passion, their heart yielded to hatred, their heart yielded to confusion. On account of this they were remorseful and said:

"The course of training has been made known by the lord, and we thought to have seen what we did not see . . . and spoke with undue estimate of ourselves. What now if we have fallen into an offence involving defeat?" They told this matter to the venerable Ānanda. The venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Ānanda, these are monks who are aware of the seen in the unseen . . . and speak of profound knowledge

---

[1] *Alamariyañāṇadassana*. *VA*. 489 says that the highest ariyan purity is knowledge and insight. *Alaŋ* is expl. *pariyattaŋ*, sufficient, enough, so that *alaŋ* means "intent on enough ariyan knowledge and insight for the destruction of the kilesas."

[2] *Āpanna*, *cf*. below, *Old Comy*. explanation, p. 160, and *VA*. 492, "because he has fallen (*āpannto*) into defeat, therefore, putting monkdom to one side, he cannot become one to arrive at musing and so forth"—musing, etc., being given in explanation of states of further-men, see below, p. 159.

[3] *Aññā*. *Cf*. above, p. 120, n. 2.

[4] *Adhimāna*, pride, arrogance.

[5] *Namati*, intrans.; *cittaṃ* is the subject. *Cf*. *S*. i. 137.

through undue estimate of themselves; but this is negligible.[1] And thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should boast, with reference to himself of a state of further-men, sufficient ariyan knowledge and insight, though not knowing it fully, and saying: 'This I know, this I see,' then if later on, he, being pressed or not being pressed, fallen, should desire to be purified, and should say: 'Your reverence, I said that I know what I do not know, see what I do not see, I spoke idly, falsely, vainly,' apart from the undue estimate of himself, he also is one who is defeated, he is not in communion." || **2** ||

Not knowing fully means: not knowing, not seeing a good state in the self as non-existent, not fact, not to be found (yet) he says: 'For me there is a good state.'

A state of further-men means: musing, freedom, concentration, attainment, knowledge and insight, making the Way to become,[2] realisation of the fruits, destruction of the corruptions, delight in solitude for the mind devoid of the hindrances.

With reference to himself means: either he presents these good states in the self, or he presents the self among these good states.

Knowledge means: the three knowledges.

Insight means: what is knowledge, that is insight; what is insight, that is knowledge.[3] [**91**]

Should boast of means: should proclaim to a woman or to a man or to a householder or to one who has gone forth into homelessness.

This I know, this I see means: I know these states,

---

[1] *Tañ ca kho etaṃ abbohārikan ti.* Same phrase occurs again below, p. 196. Because *VA.* 488 says that the phrase means that "it does not belong to the business and is not a form of offence", I take the *ti* after *abbohārika* to mean that the phrase was uttered by Gotama and not by the monks. The word seems to mean "not to the point, irrelevant." See *Pts. Contr.*, p. 361, n. 4.

[2] *Maggabhāvanā*, or making the (four) ways (to arahanship) become. But see *Old Comy.'s* definition, below, p. 161.

[3] Repeated at *VA.* 489.

I see these states, and there are in me these states, and I live conformably to these states.

If later on means: in the moment in which there is an occurrence, at that moment, that second, that fraction of time, it has passed.

Being pressed means: when a matter is acknowledged, then being pressed in this matter, one says: 'What was attained by you, how was it attained by you, when was it attained by you, where was it attained by you? How many corruptions are destroyed by you? Of how many states are you possessed?'

Not being pressed means: nothing being said.

Fallen means: one who has evil desires, evil longings, laying claim to a non-existent state of further men which is not a fact, is one who has fallen into an offence entailing defeat.

Should desire to be purified means: he is desirous of being a householder or he is desirous of being a lay-follower or he is desirous of being a park-keeper or he is desirous of being a probationer.[1]

Your reverence, I said that I know what I do not know, see what I do not see, (but) I do not know these states, I do not see these states, and in me there are not these states, nor do I live conformably with these states.

I spoke idly, falsely, vainly, means: emptiness was spoken by me, a lie was spoken by me, a falsehood[2] was spoken by me, it was spoken by me not knowing.

Apart from an undue estimate of himself means: setting aside an undue estimate of oneself.

He also means: is called so, referring to the preceding.

Is one who is defeated means: just as a palmyra tree cut off at the crown cannot become one[3] for new growth,

---

[1] *VA.* 492 says, "Inasmuch as being a house-man, a lay-follower, a park-keeper, or a probationer he is able (*bhabba*) to set going the way to heaven through giving, the refuges, morality and the restraints, or the way to freedom through musing and freedom, therefore the state of a householder and so on is called pure; therefore desiring this purity, he is said to be one desiring purity."

[2] *Abhūta,* something that has not become. [3] *abhabba.*

so a monk with evil intentions, claiming a non-existent state of further-men which is not a fact, is not a (true) recluse, not a (true) son of the Sakyans[1]—therefore he is called *one who is defeated.*

He is not in communion means: *communion* is called one work, one rule, an equal training—this is called communion. He who is not together with this is therefore called *not in communion.* || **3** ||

A state of further-men[2] means: musing, freedom, concentration, attainment, knowledge and insight, making the Way to become, realisation of the fruits, destruction of the corruptions, delight in solitude for the mind devoid of the hindrances.

Musing means: the first musing, the second musing, the third musing, the fourth musing.

Freedom means: void freedom, signless freedom, freedom in which there is no hankering.[3] [**92**]

Concentration means: void concentration, signless concentration, concentration in which there is no hankering.[4]

Attainment means: void attainment, signless attainment, attainment in which there is no hankering.

Knowledge means: the three knowledges.[5]

Making the Way to become means: the four presences of mindfulness, the four right efforts, the four bases of

[1] *Cf. Vin.* i. 97, where it is also said that the monk is not even to say that he delights in solitude.

[2] This definition=that given above, p. 159. From here to end of || 1 || below=*Vin.* iv. 25-26.

[3] *VA.* 493 says that void means void of passion, hatred and confusion. "Signless" and "in which there is no hankering" are also explained with reference to these three. At *Pts.* ii. 35 the long homily begins: "Monks, there are these three kinds of freedom: that of the void, that of the signless, that in which there is no hankering." *Cf. S.* iv. 295 (where *appaṇihita* is trans. "aimless") *Cf. Vism.* 658, *Asl.* 223, where in the trans. *appaṇihita* is rendered "unhankered" and "undesired" respectively. At *Miln.* 333, 337 the trans. is given as "the freedom (or concentration) in which no low aspirations remain." In trans. of *Dhs.* 351, 507 ff. *appaṇihita* is rendered "unaimed at."

[4] *Cf. S.* iv. 360. [5] =above, p. 159.

psychic potencies, the five faculties, the five powers, the seven things helpful to enlightenment, the noble eightfold Way.[1]

Realisation of the fruits means: realisation of the fruit of stream-attainment, realisation of the fruit of once-returning, realisation of the fruit of no-return, realisation of the fruit of perfection.

Destruction of the corruptions means: the destruction of passion, the destruction of hatred, the destruction of confusion.[2]

For the mind devoid of hindrances means: the mind devoid of the hindrance of passion, the mind devoid of the hindrance of hatred, the mind devoid of the hindrance of confusion.

Delight in solitude means: during the first musing there is delight in solitude, during the second musing . . . during the third musing . . . during the fourth musing there is delight in solitude. ‖ 1 ‖

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, "In three ways may I enter upon the first musing": before he has lied he knows, "I am going to lie"; while lying he knows, "I am lying"; having lied he knows, "I lied."[3]

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, "In four ways may I enter upon the first musing": before he has lied he knows, "I am going to lie"; while lying he knows, "I am lying";

[1] This is the usual order in which these thirty-seven things helpful to enlightenment, as they are called in the *Comys.*, appear. But another order is sometimes given. See Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Sakya* 395 and *K.S.* V., vi. ff.

[2] *Cf. S.* iv. 251, where the definition of *nibbāna* is *rāgakkhaya, dosakkhaya, mohakkhaya* (instead of *pahāna*, as above)=*S.* iv. 252 in definition of *arahatta*. *VA.* 494 says, "passion and hatred are destroyed by the third Way, confusion by the fourth Way."

[3] Here are three tenses of the verb *bhaṇati*: *bhaṇissaṃ, bhaṇāmi, bhaṇitaṃ*. *Cf. Vin.* iv. 2 ff. to end of ‖ 2 ‖ below. *Cf. M.* i. 414 where Gotama speaks to Rāhula on "conscious lying." This Rāhulovāda is famous as being alluded to in an Asoka Edict; see Hultzsch, *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, vol. i., 1925, pp. 172, 173.

having lied he knows, "I lied," so misrepresenting his opinion.

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, "In five ways may I enter upon the first musing": before he has lied . . . so misrepresenting his opinion, so misrepresenting his approval.

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, "In six ways may I enter upon the first musing": before he has lied . . . so misrepresenting his opinion, so misrepresenting his approval, so misrepresenting his pleasure.

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, "In seven ways may I enter upon the first musing" . . . so misrepresenting his opinion, so misrepresenting his approval, so misrepresenting his pleasure, so misrepresenting his intention.[1] || 2 ||

There is an offence . . . "In three ways do I enter upon the first musing" . . . wrongly representing his intention.

There is an offence . . . "In three ways did I enter upon the first musing" . . . wrongly representing his intention.

There is an offence . . . 'In three ways am I possessed of the first musing" . . . wrongly representing his intention.

There is an offence . . . "In three ways am I master of the first musing" . . . wrongly representing his intention. **[93]**

There is an offence . . . "In three ways is the first musing realised by me" . . . wrongly representing his intention. || 3 ||

There is an offence . . . "In three ways will I enter upon the second . . . the third . . . the fourth musing . . . In three

[1] These four psychological modalities are added to the three tenses of the verb *bhaṇati*. They are *diṭṭhi, khanti, ruci, bhāva,* which I have trans. as opinion, approval, pleasure, intention, respectively. They are, as it were, added on to the three modes of the verb, thus making seven constituents. Bu. at *VA*. 400 points out a contradiction in the Parivāra (*Vin.* v. 136), which attributes eight *aṅgā* (lit. limbs, thus constituents) to a lie, for it adds (*vinidhāya-*) *saññaṃ*, knowledge, to the above seven. These expressions also occur at *Vin.* ii. 295; iv. 2 ff. *Cf.* also *Vbh.* 245 where these with *ādāya*, a casually taken-up belief (*cf. Vin.* i. 70), instead of *bhāva* are given in definition of *idha*, here, now. And *cf. Nd.* i. 64 f. where *laddhi*, a religious belief, view, especially an heretical view, is substituted for *bhāva*. Three of these terms occur below at p. 305.

ways do I enter upon . . . did I enter upon . . . am I possessed of the fourth musing . . . am I master of the fourth musing . . . is the fourth musing realised by me." . . . As this first musing has been explained in detail so should they all be explained in detail. || 4 ||

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, "In three ways will I enter upon the void freedom, the signless freedom,[1] the freedom in which there is no hankering." . . . "In three ways do I . . . did I enter upon . . . am I possessed of . . . am I master of . . . is the freedom in which there is no hankering realised by me." . . .

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, "In three ways will I enter upon the void concentration, the signless concentration, the concentration in which there is no hankering . . . do I enter upon . . . did I enter upon . . . am I possessed of . . . am I master of . . . is the concentration in which there is no hankering realised by me." . . .

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, "In three ways will I enter upon the void attainment[2] . . . the signless attainment . . . the attainment in which there is no hankering . . . do I enter . . . did I enter . . . am I possessed of . . . am I master of . . . is the attainment in which there is no hankering realised by me."

. . . "In three ways will I enter upon the threefold knowledge . . . is the threefold knowledge realised by me." . . .

. . . "In three ways will I enter upon the four presences of mindfulness . . . the four right efforts . . . the four bases of psychic potency . . . the five faculties . . . the five powers . . . the seven things helpful to enlightenment . . . the noble eightfold Way . . . is the noble eightfold Way realised by me."

. . . "In three ways will I enter upon the fruit of stream-attainment . . . the fruit of once-returning . . .

---

[1] See above, p. 161.
[2] *Cf. Vin.* iv. 26 ff.

the fruit of non-return . . . perfection . . . is perfection realised by me." [94]

. . . "In three ways is passion given up by me, is passion renounced by me, is passion sacrificed by me, is passion destroyed by me, is passion forsaken by me, is passion thrown aside by me, is passion rejected by me."

. . . "In three ways is my heart devoid of the hindrance of passion . . . of the hindrance of hatred . . . of the hindrance of confusion . . ." before he has lied he knows . . . so wrongly representing his intention.

Told is that connected with purity || 5 ||

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, "In three ways will I attain the first musing and the second musing . . . have been realised by me."

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, "In three ways will I attain the first musing and the third musing . . . will I attain the first musing and the fourth musing . . . will I attain the first musing and the void freedom . . . the first musing and the signless freedom . . . the first musing and the freedom which is without hankering . . . the first musing and the void concentration . . . the first musing and the signless concentration . . . the first musing and the concentration which is without hankering . . . the first musing and the void attainment . . . the first musing and the signless attainment . . . the first musing and the attainment which is without hankering . . . the first musing and the threefold wisdom . . . the first musing and the four presences of mindfulness . . . the first musing and the four right efforts . . . the first musing and the four bases of psychic potency . . . the first musing and the five faculties . . . the first musing and the five [95] powers . . . the first musing and the seven things helpful to enlightenment . . . the first musing and the noble eightfold way . . . the first musing and the fruit of stream-attainment . . . the first musing and the fruit of once-returning . . . the first musing and the fruit of no-return . . . the first musing and perfection . . . will I enter upon the first musing with passion given up by me . . . with passion renounced by me . . . sacrificed . . . destroyed . . . forsaken . . . thrown aside . . . rejected by me."

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, "In three ways do I enter upon . . . did I enter upon

the first musing . . . and I am possessed of the first musing . . . I am master of the first musing . . . is the first musing realised by me and passion is given up by me . . . and hatred is given up by me . . . and confusion is given up by me . . . and the first musing is realised by me and my heart is devoid of the hindrance of passion . . . my heart is devoid of the hindrance of hatred . . . my heart is devoid of the hindrance of confusion."

Told is a portion of the series || 6 ||

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, "In three ways will I enter upon the second musing and the third musing . . . upon the second musing and upon the fourth musing . . . and my heart is devoid of the hindrance of confusion."

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, "In three ways will I enter upon the second musing and the first musing . . . is it realised by me. . . ."

Told is the contracted series || 7 ||

So one by one with the exception of the first members should the contracted series which has been recited be treated.

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, "In three ways is my heart devoid of the hindrance of confusion and I will enter upon the first musing . . . and the second musing . . . and the third musing . . . and the fourth musing . . . has been realised by me . . . in three ways is my heart devoid of the hindrance of confusion [96] and I will enter upon the void freedom . . . is my heart devoid of the hindrance of confusion and is my heart devoid of the hindrance of hatred . . .

Beginning with one || 8 ||

Beginning with two and beginning with three and beginning with four and beginning with five and beginning with six and beginning with seven and beginning with eight and beginning with nine and beginning with ten should be explained in detail like that beginning with one. This is that beginning with all:

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, "In three ways will I . . . do I . . . did I enter upon the first musing and the second musing and the third musing and the fourth musing and the void freedom and the signless freedom and the freedom in which there is no hankering and the void concentration and the signless concentration and the concentration in which there is no hankering and the void attainment and the signless attainment and the attainment in which there is no hankering and the threefold knowledge and the four presences of mindfulness and the four right efforts and the four bases of psychic potency and the five faculties and the five powers and the seven things helpful to enlightenment and the noble eightfold Way and the fruit of stream-attainment and the fruit of once-returning and the fruit of non-return and perfection, and with passion given up by me . . . hatred given up by me . . . confusion given up by me, renounced, sacrificed, destroyed, forsaken, thrown aside, rejected, and my heart devoid of the hindrance of passion and . . . devoid of the hindrance of hatred and . . . devoid of the hindrance of confusion," if before he has lied he knows, "I am going to lie"; while lying he knows, "I am lying"; having lied he knows, "I lied," so giving a misrepresentation of his opinion, a misrepresentation of his approval, a misrepresentation of his pleasure, a misrepresentation of his intention.

Told is that beginning with all || 9 || **4** ||

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, "In three ways may I enter upon the first musing," and for acknowledging this, if he is desirous of saying,[1] "I may attain the second musing"

[1] *vattukāma, cf. Vism.* 522=*VbhA.* 130. Oldenberg says, *Vin.* iii. 272, "the MSS. constantly read vatthukāmo, vatthuvisārakassa" (below). "I have no doubt that I was right in correcting vattuk°, vattuv°." This is borne out by *VA.* 500 f.

—but if he does not acknowledge it there is a grave offence.

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, " In three ways may I enter upon the first musing," and for acknowledging this if he is desirous of saying, " I may enter upon the third musing . . . the fourth musing "—but if he does not acknowledge it there is a grave offence.

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, " In three ways may I enter upon the first musing " and for acknowledging this, if he is desirous of saying, " My mind is devoid of the hindrance of confusion "—but if he does not acknowledge it there is a grave offence: before he has lied he knows, " I am going to lie " . . . having lied he knows, " I lied," so misrepresenting his opinion . . . his intention.

Portion of the series of the expanded talk on that beginning with one || 1 || [97]

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, " In three ways may I enter upon the second musing," and for acknowledging this, if he is desirous of saying, " I may enter upon the third musing . . . the first musing . . . " . . . but if he does not acknowledge it there is a grave offence . . .

Concise statement of the contracted series of the expanded talk for that beginning with one || 2 ||

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, " In three ways is my heart devoid of the hindrance of confusion " and for acknowledging it, if he is desirous of saying, " I may enter upon the first musing . . . " . . . a grave offence . . .

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, " In three ways will my heart be devoid of the hindrance of hatred," and for acknowledging it, if he is desirous of saying, " . . . but if he does not acknowledge it there is a grave offence."

Told is the expanded talk on that beginning with one || 3 ||

That beginning with two and that beginning with three and . . . that beginning with ten should be treated in the same way. This is that beginning with all:

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie and acknowledging it, that, "In three ways may I enter upon the first musing," if he is desirous of saying, " . . . my heart is devoid of the hindrance of confusion "—there is a grave offence for not acknowledging it.

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie and acknowledging it, that, "In three ways may I enter upon the second musing and the third musing and the fourth musing and the freedom which is void . . . and perfection, with passion given up by me, renounced by me, sacrificed, destroyed, forsaken, thrown aside, rejected, and with hatred given up by me . . . and with confusion given up by me . . . and with my heart devoid of the hindrance of passion . . . and of the hindrance of hatred . . . and of the hindrance of confusion," if he is desirous of saying, "I may enter upon the first musing "—but there is a grave offence if he does not acknowledge it . . .

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie and acknowledging it, that, "In three ways may I enter upon the third musing and the fourth musing . . . with my heart devoid of the hindrance of confusion and I may enter upon the first musing," if he is desirous of saying, "I may enter upon the second musing" . . . a grave offence. . . . There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie and acknowledging it, that, " In three ways is my heart devoid of the hindrance of confusion and I may enter upon the first musing and the second musing and the third musing and the fourth musing . . . and my heart is devoid of the hindrance of passion," if he is desirous of saying, " My heart is devoid of the hindrance of hatred "—but if he does not acknowledge it there is a grave offence. . . .

The expanded talk on that beginning with all. Told is the abbreviated series of the expanded talk

|| 4 || 5 || [98]

There is a grave offence for telling the conscious lie that, "In three ways may the monk who lives in a vihāra enter upon the first musing . . . does he enter upon . . . did he enter upon . . . that monk is possessed of the first musing . . . is master of the first musing . . . the first musing has been realised by that monk" and for acknowledging this—but there is an offence of wrong-doing for not acknowledging it. It is that: before he lied he knew, "I am going to lie"; . . . misrepresenting his intention.

There is a grave offence . . . "The monk who lives in this vihāra may enter upon the second musing . . . the third musing . . . the fourth musing . . . perfection . . . does enter upon . . . is realised by him" . . . an offence of wrong-doing.

There is a grave offence . . . "Passion is given up by that monk . . . hatred is given up by that monk . . . confusion is given up by that monk . . . that monk's heart is devoid of the hindrance of passion . . . of hatred . . . of confusion . . ." . . . an offence of wrong-doing.

There is a grave offence . . . "The monk who lives in that vihāra may enter upon the first musing in solitude . . . the second musing in solitude . . . the third musing in solitude . . . the fourth musing in solitude . . . does enter upon . . . entered upon . . . that monk is possessed of the fourth musing in solitude . . . is master of . . . the fourth musing has been realised by that monk in solitude . . ." . . . an offence of wrong-doing. (These are the three ways): Before he lied . . . misrepresenting his intention.

Thus should there be set out in detail the progression of the abridged fifteen || 1 ||

There is a grave offence for telling the conscious lie that, "In three ways may a monk make use of your vihāra . . . may make use of your robe . . . may make use of your alms-food . . . may make use of your lodgings . . . may make use of your medicine for the

sick . . . your vihāra has been made use of by him . . . your robe has been made use of by him . . . your alms-food has been made use of by him . . . your lodgings have been made use of by him . . . your medicine for the sick has been made use of by him . . . thanks to you he gave a vihāra . . . thanks to you he gave a robe . . . he gave alms-food . . . he gave lodgings . . . he gave medicine for the sick, that monk may enter upon the fourth musing in solitude . . . the fourth musing has been realised by that monk in solitude " . . . but if he does not acknowledge it [99] there is an offence of wrong-doing. (These are the three ways): Before he has lied he knows, "I am going to lie"; while lying he knows, "I am lying"; after he has lied he knows, "I lied," misrepresenting his opinion, misrepresenting his approval, misrepresenting his pleasure, misrepresenting his intention.

Told are the abridged fifteen ‖ 2 ‖ **6** ‖

There is no offence if there is an undue estimate of oneself, if he is not intentionally putting forward a claim, if he is mad, if he is unbalanced, if he is afflicted by pain, if he is a beginner.[1] ‖ **7** ‖

About undue estimate of oneself, in the jungle, alms, a teacher,[2] behaviour,
Fetters, being in private, a vihāra, attended,/
Not difficult, energy, and then the fear of death, remorse your reverence,[3] rightness,

[1] *VA.* 502 says that the monks from the banks of the Vaggumudā were beginners, therefore there was no offence for them.

[2] *Upajjhā*, a short form of *upajjhāya*, found in *Vin.*—*e.g.*, i. 94; iii. 35; at *Vin.* iv. 326 *upajjhā* is feminine.

[3] *Vippaṭisārī*: "strongly remembering something against (oneself), so generally 'remorse,'" thus *G.S.* iii. 125, n. 2 (on *A.* iii. 165=*Pug.* 64). *Cf. Vin.* ii. 249=*A.* iii. 197 for the refrain: "there's no need for remorse in thee," which is the result of being exhorted on five scores on which no remorse ought to be set up. See *G.S.* iii. 145. The word is also sometimes translated "regret, repentance."

By energy, by being intent, by accomplishment,[1] then on feeling,[1] two on giving in,/
Five stories of a brahmin, three on uttering profound knowledge,
Houses, rejected sense-pleasure, then delights, setting forth,/
The cattle butchers are either[2] bones (or) a lump of flesh, the morsel was a fowler, the sheep-butcher is flayed,
The pig-butcher has swords, a deer-hunter knives, a fletcher arrows, an animal-tamer needles,/
He was a slanderer who was sewn, the bearer of his private organs was a village fraud,
An adulterer is fallen into a pit, the eater of dung was a wicked brahmin,/
The flayed woman was an adulteress, the ill-favoured woman was a woman fortune-teller,
The dried-up woman scattered coals on the co-wife, the beheaded one was an executioner,/
A monk, a nun, a female probationer, a novice, a female novice,
These having gone forth in the discipline of Kassapa did evil deeds at once,[3]/
The Tapodā in Rājagaha, a fight, and on the plunging of elephants,
The monk Sobhita, perfected one, remembers five hundred kalpas.

Although I have translated *kukkuccaṃ hoti* as "was remorseful" and although *kukkucca* and *vippaṭisārī* are often found together, I keep "remorseful" also for *vippaṭisārī*, for "regret" seems not forceful enough, and "repentance" is now by Westerners associated with "repenting of a sin"—an idea foreign to Buddhism. *Vippaṭisārī* comes near to "bad conscience," which is also remembering something against oneself. Words for conscience are sadly lacking in Pali, but this may be an attempt to express the idea of it, emerging in the sixth century B.C.

[1] These two on feeling, if that means physical pain, seem to be included in the next, "on giving in." Or, and this is more likely and was suggested by Oldenberg, *Vin.* iii. 272, "two stories appear to be wanting"—*i.e.*, those corresponding to *ārādhanāya* and *vedanāya*.

[2] *Ubho.*

[3] *Tāvade.*

Now at one time a certain monk, through undue estimate of himself, declared profound knowledge.[1] He was remorseful, and said: "The course of training has been made known by the lord. What now if I have fallen into an offence involving defeat?" So this monk told this matter to the lord . . . "There is no offence, monk, (merely) because there was an undue estimate of yourself." || 1 ||

Now at one time a certain monk [100] lived in the jungle having made a wish[2]: "Thus may people esteem me!"[3] People esteemed him. He was remorseful . . . "Monk, there is no offence involving defeat. But, monks, there should not be living[4] in the jungle having made a wish. Whoever should dwell thus—there is an offence of wrong-doing."

Now at one time a certain monk was going for alms having made a wish: "Thus may people esteem me!" People esteemed him. He was remorseful . . . "Monk, there is no offence involving defeat. But, monks, there should not be going for alms having made a wish. Whoever should go thus—there is an offence of wrong-doing. || 2 ||

Now at one time a certain monk spoke thus to another monk: "Your reverence, those who are pupils of our teacher are all men perfected." He was remorseful . . . He told this matter to the lord.

"Of what were you thinking, monk?" he said.

"I wanted to put forward the claim, lord," he said.

"Monk, there is no offence involving defeat; there is a grave offence," he said.

---

[1] *Aññā.*

[2] *Paṇidhāya*, ger. of *paṇidahati*. *VA.* 502, *patthanaṃ katvā*, making a wish, *cf. Jā.* i. 68. For *paṇidhāya*, *cf. A.* iii. 249=iv. 461, trans. in *G.S.* "set on gaining." *SA.* i. 99 on *S.* i. 42 explains *paṇidhāya* by *ṭhapetvā*, establishing.

[3] *VA.* 502, "May people esteem me living in the jungle as being at the stage of arahanship, or of a learner, then I will become revered by the world, venerated, respected, worshipped.

[4] *Vatthabbaṃ*, from √*vas*, to live, to dwell.

Now at one time a certain monk spoke thus to another monk:

"Your reverence, those who are the novices of our teacher are all of great psychic potency, of great majesty." He was remorseful . . .

". . . a grave offence," he said. || 3 ||

Now at one time a certain monk walked up and down, having made a wish . . . stood, having made a wish . . . sat, having made a wish . . . laid down, having made a wish: "Thus may people esteem me!" The people esteemed him. He was remorseful . . . He told this matter to the lord . . .

"There is no offence involving defeat, monk. But, monks, there should not be lying down, having made a wish. Whoever should so lie down—there is an offence of wrong-doing." || 4 ||

Now at one time a certain monk laid claim to a state of further-men in front of another monk, and spoke thus: "Your reverence, the fetters are destroyed for me." He was remorseful . . . He told this matter to the lord . . .

"You, monk, have fallen into an offence involving defeat." || 5 ||

Now at one time a certain monk, being in private, claimed a state of further-men.[1] A monk, knowing the mind of the other, blamed that monk, saying: "Do not speak thus, your reverence, this is not for you." He was remorseful . . . He told this matter to the lord . . .

"Monk, there is no offence involving defeat; there is an offence of wrong-doing."

Now at one time [**101**] a certain monk, being in private, laid claim to a state of further-men. A devatā re-

[1] According to *VA*. 503 he said, "I am an arahan," but as he did this not (really) believing it in his mind (*na manasā cintitaṃ*), it was a dukkaṭa offence.

buked this monk, saying: " Honoured sir,[1] do not speak thus, this is not for you." He was remorseful . . . He told this matter to the lord . . .

" Monk, there is no offence involving defeat; there is an offence of wrong-doing." || 6 ||

Now at one time a certain monk said to a certain lay-follower:

" Your reverence, whatever monk lives in your vihāra is one perfected." Now, he lived in his[2] vihāra. He was remorseful . . .

" Of what were you thinking, monk ?" he said.

" I wanted to put forward the claim, lord," he said.

" There is no offence involving defeat, monk; there is a grave offence."

Now at one time a certain monk said to a certain lay-follower:

" Your reverence, whomever you attend with the requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings and medicines for the sick, that monk is one perfected." But he attended him with the requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings and medicines for the sick. He was remorseful . . .

" . . . an offence of wrong-doing." || 7 ||

Now at one time a certain monk was ill. The monks said to him: " The venerable one has a state of further-men."

" Reverend sirs, it is not difficult to attain." He was remorseful, and said: " Those who are really disciples of the lord may speak thus, but I am not a disciple of the lord.[3] What now if I have fallen into an offence involving defeat ?" He told this matter to the lord.

" Of what were you thinking, monk ?" he said.

" I did not intend to put forward the claim, lord," he said.

[1] Note the way a fellow-monk uses *āvuso* in addressing a monk, while a non-monk, lay people, and, as here, a devatā, use *bhante*, honoured sir.

[2] *I.e.*, the lay-follower's.

[3] =*below*, p. 180.

"There is no offence, monk, as you did not intend to put forward the claim."[1]

Now at one time a certain monk was ill. The monks said to him: "The venerable one has a state of the further-men."

"Reverend sirs, it is not difficult to declare profound knowledge," he said. He was remorseful . . . He told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Of what were you thinking, monk?"

"I did not intend to put forward the claim, lord,"[2] he said.

"There is no offence, monk, as you did not intend to put forward the claim." || 8 ||

Now at one time a certain monk was ill. The monks said to him:

"The venerable one has a state of further-men."

"Reverend sirs, a state is to be attained by stirring up energy." He was remorseful . . . He told this matter to the lord . . .

"There is no offence, monk, as you did not intend to put forward the claim."

Now at one time a certain monk was ill. The monks said to him:

"Your reverence, do not be afraid." He said:

"Your reverences, I am not afraid of death." He was remorseful . . .

"There is no offence, monk, as you did not intend to put forward the claim."

Now at one time [**102**] a certain monk was ill. The monks said to him:

"Your reverence, do not be afraid."

---

[1] *Anullapanādhippāyassa.* *VA.* 502 says, *kohaññe icchācāre ațhatvā*, not wanting to have his needs filled by hypocrisy (or deceit). *Tr. Crit. Pali Dict.* gives, "not intending to show off, to impose," under *anulla°*.

[2] *VA.* 503, "it is not difficult for a virtuous man, who has set insight going to declare profound knowledge, he is competent to attain arahanship." But this monk did not reckon himself in this category.

"Your reverences, let him be afraid who may be remorseful."[1] He was remorseful . . .

"There is no offence, monk, as you did not intend to put forward the claim."

Now at one time a certain monk was ill. The monks said to him:

"The venerable one has a state of further-men."

"Your reverences, the state is to be attained by one who is rightly intent."[2] He was remorseful . . .

"There is no offence, monk, as you did not intend to put forward the claim."

Now at one time a certain monk was ill . . .

"Your reverences, a state is to be attained by stirring up energy."[3] He was remorseful . . .

". . . as you did not intend to put forward the claim."

Now at one time a certain monk was ill . . .

"Your reverences, a state is to be attained by one who is harnessed[4] to endeavour."[4] He was remorseful . . .

". . . as you did not intend to put forward the claim." || 9 ||

Now at one time a certain monk was ill. The monks said to him:

"We hope, your reverence, that you are getting better, we hope that you are able to support life?"

"Your reverences, it is not possible to give in because of this and that." He was remorseful . . . He told this matter to the lord . . .

---

[1] *Vippaṭisārī*, *cf.* above, p. 171, n. 3. *VA.* 504, "let the monk in whom remorse arises be afraid, but I am not remorseful, the moral precepts are completely pure, why then should I be afraid of death?"

[2] *Sammā payuttena.*

[3] As above, p. 176.

[4] *Yuttayoga.* This word also occurs at *Jā.* i. 65 and is translated "devout" (*Buddhist Birth Stories,* second edition, p. 178). *Yuñjati* (of which *yutta* is p.p.) occurs at *Jā.* iv. 131, v. 369, with *ghaṭati vāyamati,* all meaning to strive, to endeavour. *Yoga* (*yogya*) has sense of "fit for."

"Monk, there is no offence as you did not intend to put forward the claim."

Now at one time a certain monk was ill . . .

"Your reverences, it is not possible to give in because of the common people."[1] He was remorseful . . .

"Monk, of what were you thinking?" he said.

"I intended to put forward the claim, lord," he said.

"Monk, there is no offence involving defeat, there is a grave offence." || 10 ||

Now at one time a certain brahmin invited the monks, saying:

"Let the good sirs, the perfected ones, come."[2] They were remorseful, and said:

"But we are not perfected ones, and yet this brahmin addresses us with talk about perfected ones. Now what line of conduct should be taken by us?" They told this matter to the lord.

"Monks, there is no offence in a speaker with faith,"[3] he said.

---

[1] *VA.* 504, surrounding him.

[2] *Āyantu*, from *ā* + √*ī* and meaning *āgacchantu*. *VA.* 504, "Whoever said this would also have said: 'Prepare seats for all the arahans, give water for washing the feet, let the arahans wash their feet.'"

[3] *Pasādabhaññe*. Apart from the meaning of this very rare word, it is noteworthy that it is in the loc., instead of, as is usually the case after *āpatti* and *anāpatti*, in the gen. *VA.* 504 says, "The meaning being: instigated (*samussāhitassa*) through his own power of faith, being one who goes by faith." *Cf.* for *bhañña* (for which *P.T.S. Dict.* refers to *bhā*) *Jā.* v. 317, 318. The former of these passages reads *bhañ ñaṃ* with *v.l.*, *haṃñam*, *bhuñjaṃ*, and the latter explains by saying *bhā tiratanass' etaṃ nāmaṃ*. But I think that here *bhañña* derives from √*bhāṣ*, to speak, and not from √*bhās*, to shine. At *A.* ii. 31; *S.* iii. 72; *M.* iii. 78 we find *Ukkalā vassa-bhaññā*. *K.S.* iii. 63 translates *vassa-bhaññā* as "preachers in retreat"—*i.e.*, during vassa, the rains. But *SA.* ii. 279 says *vasso ca Bhañño ca*, and evidently means that these are names of people in certain districts, like *Ukkala-janapada-vāsino*; while *MA.* iv. 136 declares this to be the case: *Vasso ca Bhañño câ ti dve janā*. *Cf.* *Pts. of Contr.* 95, n. 2. I do not, however, think that the *pasādabhaññe* of *Vin.* above can refer to the Bhañña people.

Now at one time a certain brahmin invited the monks, saying:

" Let the good sirs, the perfected ones, be seated . . . Let the good sirs, the perfected ones, eat . . . Let the good sirs, the perfected ones, be regaled . . . Let the good sirs, the perfected ones, go away." . . . They were remorseful and said . . .

" . . . in a speaker with faith." || 11 ||

Now at one time a certain monk claimed a state of further-men in front of another monk, and he said:

" Your reverence, the cankers are destroyed for me." He was remorseful . . .

" You, monk, have fallen into an offence involving defeat."

Now [103] at one time a certain monk . . .

" Your reverence, these states exist for me." He was remorseful . . .

" . . . involving defeat."

Now at one time a certain monk . . .

" Your reverence, I live conformably to these states." He was remorseful . . .

" . . . involving defeat." || 12 ||

Now at one time his relations spoke thus to a certain monk:

" Come, honoured sir, live in a house." He said:

" Your reverences, one like me cannot become one to live in a house." He was remorseful . . .

" There is no offence, monk, as you did not intend to put forward the claim."

Now at one time his relations said to a certain monk:

" Come, honoured sir, enjoy the pleasures of the senses." He said:

" Your reverences, the pleasures of the senses are rejected by me."[1] He was remorseful . . .

[1] *VA*. 505, *āvaṭā ti āvāritā nivāritā paṭikkhittā ti attho.* Had they in truth been rejected he would have been an arahan. Before they attained this supreme state, monks were not indifferent to the beauties of nature, as for example some of the Theragāthā show.

"There is no offence, monk, as you did not intend to put forward the claim."

Now at one time his relations said to a certain monk: "Come, honoured sir, enjoy yourself."[1] He said: "Your reverences, I am enjoying myself with the highest enjoyment."[2] He was remorseful and said: "Those who are really the lord's disciples may speak thus, but I am not a disciple of the lord.[3] What now if I have fallen into an offence involving defeat?" He told this matter to the lord.

"Of what, monk, were you thinking?"

"I did not intend to put forward the claim, lord," he said.

"There is no offence, monk, as you did not intend to put forward the claim." || 13 ||

Now at one time a company of monks went up to a certain residence for the rains, having made this agreement: Whoever shall set out from this residence first, him we shall know for one perfected. A certain monk said:

"Let them know me for one perfected," and he set out first from that residence. He was remorseful. He told this matter to the lord . . .

"You, monk, have fallen into an offence involving defeat." || 14 || **8** ||

At one time[4] the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding place. Now at that time the venerable Lakkhaṇa[5] and the venerable Moggallāna the Great

[1] On *abhirati* and *abhiramati* see above, p. 114.

[2] *VA.* 505, "the monk says, 'Because there is no lack of exposition and questionings on the teaching, and because I enjoy this state of things, I say I am enjoying myself with the highest enjoyment.'"

[3] =above, p. 175.

[4] =*S.* ii. 254-262 from here to end of || 3 || below.

[5] *VA.* 506=*SA.* ii. 216, "He from among a thousand Jaṭilas (matted hair ascetics) received the 'Come, monk' for upasampadā ordination. He attained arahanship at the end of the Discourse

were staying on the summit of the Vulture's Peak. Then the venerable Moggallāna the Great, rising up early and taking his bowl and robe, approached the venerable Lakkhaṇa, and having approached the venerable Lakkhaṇa, he said:

"Let us go, reverend Lakkhaṇa, we will enter Rājagaha for alms-food."

"So be it, your reverence," the venerable Lakkhaṇa answered the venerable Moggallāna the Great. Then the venerable Moggallāna the Great, [**104**] as he was descending from the summit of the Vulture's Peak, smiled (when he came to) a certain place. Then the venerable Lakkhaṇa said to the venerable Moggallāna the Great:

"Now, reverend Moggallāna, what is the reason, what the cause, that you smile?"

"This is not the time, reverend Lakkhaṇa, for this question. Ask me this question in the presence of the lord." || 1 ||

Then the venerable Lakkhaṇa and the venerable Moggallāna the Great, having been for alms-food in Rājagaha, and having dined and come away from their meal, approached the lord and having approached and saluted the lord, they sat down to one side. As they were sitting to one side, the venerable Lakkhaṇa said to the venerable Moggallāna the Great:

"Now as the venerable Moggallāna the Great was descending from the summit of the Vulture's Peak, he smiled (when he came to) a certain place. Now what, reverend Moggallāna, is the cause, what the reason, that you smiled?"

"Just now, your reverence, as I was descending from

on Burning. He should be called one great disciple (*eko mahāsāvako*). Inasmuch as he is endowed with this mark and is possessed of a Brahmā-like existence, he is called Lakkhaṇa. Mahā-Moggallāna, the second great disciple, attained arahanship on the seventh day after he had gone forth into homelessness." This mention of Moggallāna as second to Lakkhaṇa is curious, for in the Suttas he is only ever linked with Sāriputta. See *Vin.* i. 33 ff. for the story of the conversion of the Jaṭilas.

the summit of the Vulture's Peak, I saw a skeleton going through the air,[1] and vultures, crows and hawks[2] were following hard, striking it[3] round about the ribs,[4] while it uttered a cry of distress. Then, your reverence, I thought: Indeed it is wonderful, indeed it is marvellous that a being will become like that, that a yakkha will become like that, that one having existence as an individual[5] will become like that."

The monks became annoyed, vexed, angry and said: "The venerable Moggallāna the Great is claiming a state of further-men."[6]

Then the lord addressed the monks, saying:

"Indeed, monks, there live disciples who have become vision,[7] indeed monks, there live disciples who have become knowledge, inasmuch as a disciple will know or will see or will see with his own eyes a thing like this. Monks, I saw this being before now, but I did not declare it. I could have declared it, but others would not have had faith in me, and for those who could not have had faith in me, there would have been for them pain and sorrow for a long time. Monks, this being

---

[1] *Vehāsagata*, or going above ground, *cf.* above, p. 79, n. 7.

[2] *VA.* 507 calls these *yakkha* vultures, *yakkha* crows and *yakkha* hawks, probably meaning that these birds eat flesh. *Cf.* the predatory yakkhas, above, p. 146.

[3] *Vitudenti. VA.* 507 reads *vituddhenti tî vinivijjhitvā gacchanti, vitudantî ti* (*v.l. vitudentî ti*) *vā pāṭho. S.* ii. 255 reads *vitacchenti vibhajenti*, as in the cases below, with *v.l. vitudenti* for *vitacchenti* and omitting *vibhajenti*.

[4] *Pāsuḷa*, with *v.l. pāsula*; *S.* ii. 255 reads *phāsuḷa*.

[5] *Attabhāvapaṭilābha.*

[6] Omitted at *S.* ii. 255.

[7] *Cakkhubhūta*, *bhūta* being p.p. of *bhavati*. At *A.* v. 226 the tathāgata is called *cakkhubhūto ñāṇabhūto* (as above) and *dhammabhūto brahmabhūto*, trans. at *G.S.* v. 157 "he has become the eye, he has become knowledge," etc. *VA.* 508 says, *cakkhubhutaṃ jātaṃ uppannaṃ tesan ti cakkhubhūtā, bhūtacakkhukā uppannacakkhukā. Cakkhuṃ uppādetvā viharanti dutiyapade pi es' eva nayo. AA.* on *A.* v. 226 (Siamese edition) says, *cakkhubhūto ti cakkhu viya bhūto nibbatto. Ñāṇabhūto ti ñāṇasabhāvo.* (*AA.* also explains *bhūta* in *dhamma°* and *brahma°* by *sabhāva.*)

was a cattle butcher[1] in this very Rājagaha. As a result of his deeds he was boiled[2] in hell for many years, for many hundreds of years, for many thousands of years, for many hundreds of thousands of years; now for what remains as the result of his deeds he undergoes existence as an individual like this. Monks, Moggallāna spoke truly; there is no offence for Moggallāna."[3] ||2||

. . . " Now, your reverence, as I was coming down from the summit of the Vulture's Peak, I saw a lump of flesh going through the air, and vultures, crows and hawks, following hard, were tearing at it and pulling it to pieces,[4] while it uttered a cry of distress." [105] . . . " Monks, this being was a cattle-butcher in this very Rājagaha."

. . . " Now, your reverence, as I was coming down from the summit of the Vulture's Peak, I saw a morsel of flesh going through the air, and vultures, crows and

---

[1] *VA*. 508, " at the time of his passing from the Pit (*naraka*) his outward appearance was a mass of bones . . . he has arisen as a departed one (*peta*) who is a skeleton." Of his deeds, *tassa kammassa* expl. *tassa nānācetanāhi āyūhi tassa aparāpariyakammassa*.

[2] *paccitvā*, passive of *pacati*. *Paccati* is lit. to be boiled or cooked, *P.T.S. Dict.* saying, " Nearly always applied to the torture of boiling in niraya, where it is meant literally." But I think that the idea (found in the active) of ripening and maturing for the next rebirth is also intended. The context brings out this point. One was not condemned to eternal damnation. *VA*. 508 also emphasises this by saying that through what remained of the result of his deeds after his reinstatement (*paṭisandhi*) in naraka, he took on reinstatement again among the petas. I have translated *paccitvā* literally, since for lack of an English word to express the idea of being boiled to a ripeness which entails a change, it seems to me preferable to " has been punished " (*K.S.* ii. 170), as this conveys the idea still less of the past deeds maturing until the individual is ready for a new rebirth.

[3] Omitted at *S*. ii. 256.

[4] *Cf. M.* i. 364, where the simile is possibly taken from this *Vin.* passage. *M.* i. 364 reads, *vitaccheyyuṃ virājeyyuṃ*, trans. *Fur. Dial.* i. 261, " to tear and rend it." *Virājenti* is a *v.l.* for *vibhajenti* at both *Vin.* iii. 105 above and *S*. ii. 256, and it would not seem unintelligible in these contexts.

hawks, following hard, were tearing at it and pulling it to pieces, while it uttered a cry of distress." . . . "Monks, this being was a fowler[1] in this very Rājagaha."

. . . "Now, your reverence, as I was coming down from the summit of the Vulture's Peak, I saw a flayed man going through the air, and vultures, crows and hawks, following hard, were tearing at it and pulling it to pieces, while it uttered a cry of distress." . . . "Monks, this being was a sheep-butcher[2] in this very Rājagaha."

. . . "Now, your reverence, as I was coming down from the summit of the Vulture's Peak, I saw a man who had swords for hair going through the air. These swords of his, constantly flying up into the air, fell down on his body while he uttered a cry of distress." . . .

"Monks, this being was a butcher of pigs in this very Rājagaha."[3]

. . . "Now, your reverence, as I was coming down . . . I saw a man with knives for hair going through the air. These knives of his constantly flying up into the air fell down on his body, while he uttered a cry of distress." . . . "Monks, this being was a deer-hunter in this very Rājagaha."[4]

. . . "Now, your reverence, as I was coming down . . . I saw a man with arrows for hair going through the air. These arrows of his . . ." . . . ". . . was a fletcher[5] in this very Rājagaha."'

---

[1] *VA.* 509, "at the time of his passing from the Pit (*naraka*) his outward appearance was a piece of flesh, therefore he arose as a departed one who is a piece of flesh."

[2] *orabbhika, VA.* 509, *eḷake vidhitvā,* having skinned them during his life, afterwards his appearance was that of a skinless ram's body, and therefore he has arisen as a departed one who is flayed (*nicchavipeto*).

[3] He killed the pigs with swords, thus his outward appearance is the state of having drawn swords, thus he has arisen as a departed one who has swords for hair.

[4] His outward appearance is a state of being struck with knives, because he killed the deer with knives.

[5] *kāraṇika,* but judge at *K.S.* ii. 171, which has n. "cruel to criminals." According to the *Comys.* "a man causing death,

. . . "Now, your reverence, as I was coming down . . . I saw a man having hair like needles going through the air. These needles of his . . ." . . . " . . . was an animal-tamer[1] in this very Rājagaha."

. . . "Now, your reverence, as I was coming down . . . I saw a man having hair like needles going through the air. These needles of his piercing his head came out through his mouth, entering his mouth they came out through his breast, entering his breast they came out through his stomach, entering his stomach they came out through his thighs, entering his thighs they came out through his legs, entering his legs they came out through his feet, while he uttered a cry of distress." . . . " . . . was a slanderer in this very Rājagaha."

. . . "Now, your reverence, as I was . . . I saw a demon-man[2] going through the air. When he moves he goes having put his secret organs on to his shoulder, when he sits he sits among these secret organs, so that vultures, crows and hawks following hard, were tearing at him and pulling him to pieces, while he uttered a cry of distress . . ." . . . " . . . was a village fraud in this very Rājagaha."

. . . "Now, your reverence, as I was . . . I saw a man, head and all, tumbled into a dung-pit . . ."

---

shooting with arrows," *kaṇḍena vijjhitvā*. Hence possibly the confusion, *P.T.S. Dict.*, referring only to *S.* ii. 257, and saying, "*usu*°, however, used simply in the sense of making: arrow-maker, fletcher."

[1] *sārathi*. *S.* ii. 257 reads, *sūcako* here as in the next example. Translator at *K.S.* ii. 172 suggests *sūto* for *sūcako*. Both words, according to *P.T.S. Dict.*, mean charioteer or coachman, but *VA.* 509 and *SA.* ii. 220 (under *sūtò*, with n. that title in text *sūci-sārathi*) speak of horse-tamer, cow-tamer.

[2] *kumbhaṇḍa*. Note word-play on *aṇḍa*. *VA.* 510=*SA.* ii. 220 says, *kumbhamattā mahāghaṭappamāṇā aṇḍā ahesuṃ*, while *Jā.* iii. 147 defines as *kumbhamattarahassaṅgā mahodarā yakkhā*. Our *Comys.* say that as he had made others suffer by his secret wrong-doing, so now he suffers in his secret organs. At *DA.* i. 73 a *kumbhaṇḍa* is placed on the back of a horse as a sign of instability. *Kumbhaṇḍī* at *Vism.* 183, in connection with *latā*, creeper, trans. "pumpkin." This is evidently the secondary meaning of the word.

. . . "Monks, this being was an adulterer in this very Rājagaha."

. . . "Now, your reverence, as I was [106] . . . I saw a man, head and all, tumbled into a dung-pit and eating dung with both hands . . ." . . . "Monks, this being was a wicked brahmin in this very Rājagaha. He, at the time of Kassapa, the all-enlightened one, having invited a company of monks to a meal, and having had a trough filled with dung, and having had the time announced, said: "I say, let my masters eat as much as they like, and carry away as much as they need."

. . . "Now, your reverence, as I was . . . I saw a flayed woman going through the air. Vultures . . . were pulling her to pieces, while she uttered a cry of distress . . ." . . . "Monks, this woman was an adulteress in this very Rājagaha."[1]

. . . "Now, your reverence, as I was . . . I saw a malodorous, ill-favoured woman going through the air. Vultures . . . were pulling her to pieces . . ." . . . ". . . was a fortune-teller[2] in this very Rājagaha."

. . . "Now, your reverence, as I was . . . I saw a woman, shrivelled up, dried up because of some cutaneous disease,[3] going through the air . . . while she uttered a cry of distress." . . . "Monks, this woman was the chief consort of King Kālinga; overcome by envy she threw out her rival,[4] scattering a brazier of burning coals over her."

---

[1] Inasmuch as she got her pleasures with other men, not with her own husband, she is reborn flayed so as to undergo a painful contact, being deprived of pleasant touch. *VA.* 510.

[2] *VA.* 511, deceiving the people by taking gifts of flowers and perfumes from them, saying, "now there will be increase for you."

[3] *upakkaṃ okiliniṃ okiriniṃ.* Bu. at *VA.* 511 says, "she fell on to a heap of coals . . . therefore, she is shrivelled by the agonising fires; *okilinī* and her body inflamed, drop upon drop oozing from her body; *okiriṇī* and surrounded by charcoal; from below the charcoal was on both sides of her, like the red flowers of the kiṃsuka tree; the charcoal fell from the air on her."

[4] She was a dancer who had pleased the King by massaging him.

. . . "Now, your reverence, as I was . . . I saw the headless trunk of a body going through the air. Its eyes and even its mouth were on its breast. Vultures . . . were pulling it to pieces while it uttered a cry of distress . . ." . . . "Monks, this being was an executioner called Hārika in this very Rājagaha."[1]

. . . "Now, your reverence, as I was . . . I saw a monk going through the air. His outer cloak was burning,[2] in flames and ablaze, moreover his bowl was burning, in flames and ablaze, moreover his girdle was burning, in flames and ablaze, moreover his body was burning, in flames and ablaze, and he was uttering a cry of distress . . ." . . . "Monks, in the time of Kassapa, the all-enlightened one, this monk was a depraved monk."[3]

. . . "Now, your reverence, as I was . . . I saw a nun . . . I saw a (female) probationer[4] . . . I saw a novice . . . I saw a female novice going through the air. Her outer cloak was burning, in flames, and ablaze . . . while she uttered a cry of distress. Then, your reverence, I thought: indeed it is wonderful, indeed it is marvellous, that a being may become like that, that a yakkha may become like that, that one having existence as an individual may become like that."

The monks became annoyed, vexed and angry and said:

"The venerable Moggallāna is claiming a state of further-men."[5]

Then the lord addressed the monks, saying:

"Indeed, monks, there live disciples who have be-

---

[1] *VA.* 512, for a long time he had beheaded thieves at the king's command. Therefore he was reborn headless.

[2] Quoted at *MA.* i. 91, and said to refer to the monk Kapila. *VA.* mentions no names.

[3] He went about enjoying himself to his heart's content, therefore he was boiled in hell for an interval between Buddhas, and then arising in a *peta*-world he arose with an existence like a monk.

[4] Fem. in Table of Contents, above, p. 172.

[5] Omitted at *S.* ii. 261.

come vision, there live disciples who have become knowledge, [107] inasmuch as a disciple will know or will see or will see with his own eyes a thing like this. Monks, I saw this female novice before now, but I did not declare it. I could have declared it, but others would not have had faith in me, and for those who could not have had faith in me, there would have been for them pain and sorrow for a long time. Monks, at the time of Kassapa, the all-enlightened one, this female novice was a depraved female novice. As a result of her deeds, she was boiled in hell for many years, for many hundreds of years, for many thousands of years, for many hundreds of thousands of years. Now, because of what remains as the result of her deeds, she undergoes existence as an individual like this. Monks, Moggallāna spoke truly; there is no offence for Moggallāna." || 3 ||

Then the venerable Moggallāna the Great addressed the monks thus:

"Your reverences, this Tapodā flows from this: this lake of beautiful water, of cool water, of sweet water, of pure water, with lovely and charming fords, with an abundance of fishes and turtles, and lotuses bloom for the measure of a cycle. And yet this Tapodā as it flows is boiling."

The monks became . . . angry and said:

"How can the venerable Moggallāna the Great speak thus: 'Your reverences, this Tapodā flows from this . . . is boiling?' The venerable Moggallāna the Great is claiming a state of further-men." They told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Monks, this Tapodā flows from this: this lake of beautiful water . . . lotuses bloom for the measure of a cycle. But, monks, the Tapodā comes between the two great hells,[1] that is why the Tapodā as it flows

[1] Tapodā means "boiling waters." *VA.* 512, says, "they say that the town of Rājagaha is near the world of the departed, and this Tapodā comes there between the two great red pits of the hells." *Cf.* below, p. 274, n. 6. At *A.* v. 196 Ānanda and the wanderer Kokanuda went to this river to bathe their limbs.

is boiling. Monks, Moggallāna spoke truly. There is no offence for Moggallāna." || 4 ||

At one time King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha was defeated in a conflict with the Licchavis. Then the king, after collecting his armies, beat the Licchavis and the drum of victory went into the conflict, and the Licchavis were defeated by the king. Then the venerable Moggallāna the Great addressed the monks saying: "Your reverences, the king was defeated by the Licchavis, and the drum of victory went into the conflict, and the Licchavis were defeated by the king." The monks became annoyed, vexed and angry and said: "How can the venerable Moggallāna speak thus: 'Your reverences, the king was defeated by the Licchavis, and the drum of victory went into the conflict, and then the Licchavis were defeated by the king.' The venerable Moggallāna the Great is claiming a state of further-men." They told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Monks, first the king was defeated by the Licchavis, [108] and then after the king had collected the army, he beat the Licchavis. Moggallāna spoke truly. There is no offence for Moggallāna." || 5 ||

Then the venerable Moggallāna the Great addressed the monks, saying:

"Now I, your reverences, having entered upon steadfast contemplation on the banks of the river Sappinikā,[1] heard the noise of elephants plunging, crossing over and trumpeting."[2]

The monks became annoyed, vexed and angry, saying: "How can the venerable Moggallāna the Great talk

---

[1] Mentioned also at *S*. i. 153; *A*. ii. 29, 176, Sappinī; at *A*. i. 185, Sappinikā; *cf*. also *Vin. Texts* i. 254, n. 2. Usually trans. the "Snake River." The wanderers had a park on its banks. It was near Rājagaha.

[2] *VA*. 513, "plunging down into the deep water, and bathing and drinking there, and taking up water with their trunks, they mingle together and cross over."

like this, saying: 'Having entered upon steadfast contemplation, I heard elephants plunging, crossing over and trumpeting?' . . . a state of further-men." They told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Monks, that was contemplation, but he was not wholly purified.[1] Moggallāna spoke truly. There is no offence for Moggallāna." || 6 ||

Then the venerable Sobhita[2] addressed the monks, saying: "Your reverences, I remember five hundred kalpas." The monks became annoyed, vexed and angry, saying:

"How can the venerable Sobhita speak thus: 'I remember five hundred kalpas'? He is claiming a state of further-men." They told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Monks, the meaning is that this is just one birth of Sobhita's. Sobhita spoke truly. There is no offence for Sobhita." || 7 || **9** ||

Told is the Fourth Offence involving Defeat

Set forth for the venerable ones are the four things involving defeat. A monk, having fallen into one or other of these, is not in communion with the monks; as before,[3] so after, he is one who is defeated, he is not

[1] *parisuddha*. *VA*. 513 f. "They say that the thera attained arahanship on the seventh day after he went forth, and had mastery in the eight attainments, but not having purified himself well in the obstructions to contemplation . . . and rising up from musing and hearing the sound of the elephants, he heard it between the attainments. Of this he was aware."

[2] *A*. i. 25 says, that he is the chief of the monks remembering his former rebirths. In his verses, *Thag*. 165, 166, he twice repeats that he remembered five hundred kalpas in a single night. At *Asl*. 32 he is said to be the third in the line of theras who conveyed the Abhidhamma up to the time of the Third Council.

[3] *Vin. Texts* i. 5, n. 2, says that the phrase *yathā pure tathā pacchā* "probably means that the monk is irrevocably defeated. He must remain for ever in the condition (of permanent exclusion from the Order) into which he has brought himself." *VA*. 516 says,

in communion. Therefore I ask the venerable ones: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? A second time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? A third time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? The venerable ones are quite pure in this matter, therefore they are silent. Thus do I understand.

Unchastity, taking what is not given, and the form of men, and those who are further,
The four matters involving defeat are without doubt a reason for punishment.[1]

Told is the Defeat Section [**109**]

" as in his time as a householder, at the time when he was not (yet) ordained, and as after when he has fallen into defeat, he is not in communion; there is not for him communion with the monks at the uposatha (observance-day), the pavāraṇā (ceremony at the end of the rains), under the rule of the Pāṭimokkha, or at the legal acts of the Order."

[1] *Chejjavatthu.* See *chejja* (√*ched*) above, p. 75, meaning maiming.

[These thirteen things, venerable ones, entailing formal meetings of the Order, come for exposition.]

FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA) I

AT one time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's park. Now at that time the venerable Seyyasaka[1] led the Brahma-life, dissatisfied.[2] Because of this he was thin, wretched, his colour bad, yellowish, the veins showing all over his body.[3] The venerable Udāyin saw the venerable Seyyasaka thin, wretched, his colour bad, yellowish, his veins showing all over his body. Seeing him thus, he said to the venerable Seyyasaka: "Reverend Seyyasaka, why are you thin, wretched . . . the veins showing all over your body? Perhaps it is that you, reverend Seyyasaka, lead the Brahma-life, dissatisfied?"

"It is so, your reverence," he said.

"Now then, you, reverend Seyyasaka, eat as much as you like, sleep as much as you like, bath[4] as much as you like: eating as much as you like, sleeping as much as you like, bathing as much as you like, if dissatisfaction arises in you and passion assails[5] your heart, then emit semen using your hand."[6]

---

[1] At *Vin.* ii. 7 ff. he is represented as being tiresome in various ways.

[2] *anabhirato*, see above, p. 114, for discussion on this term. *VA.* 517 says on this term, *vikkhittacitto kāmarāgapariḷāhena pariḍayhamāno na pana gihibhāvam patthayamāno*, upset in his mind, burning with a fever of passion and sense-desires, but not wanting the household state.

[3] stock-phrase.

[4] *VA.* 517, anointing the body with clay, rubbing on chunam.

[5] A stock-phrase, *rāgo cittaṃ anuddhaṃseti*, as at *M.* i. 26; *S.* i. 186; *A.* ii. 126. *VA.* 518 says, *kāmarāgo cittaṃ dhaṃseti padhaṃseti vikkhipati c'eva milāpeti ca. MA.* i. 142 expl. *anuddhaṃsessati* by *hiṃsissati adhibhavissati.*

[6] *VA.* 518, "Thus will your mind become one-pointed. The teacher is said to have taught this." At *VA.* 517 it is said that

"But, your reverence, are you sure that it is suitable to act like this?"

"Yes, your reverence, I do this."

Then the venerable Seyyasaka ate as much as he liked, slept as much as he liked, bathed as much as he liked; but having eaten as much as he liked, slept as much as he liked, bathed as much as he liked, dissatisfaction arose, and passion assailed his heart, so he emitted semen using his hand. Then in a short time the venerable Seyyasaka was nice-looking with rounded features, of a bright complexion and a clear skin. So the monks who were the friends of the venerable Seyyasaka spoke thus to the venerable Seyyasaka:

"Formerly, reverend Seyyasaka, you were thin, wretched, of a bad colour, yellowish, with the veins showing all over your body. But now, at present, you are nice-looking with rounded features, [**110**] of a bright complexion and a clear skin. Why now, do you take medicine,[1] reverend Seyyasaka?"

"I do not take medicine, your reverences, but I am eating as much as I like, I am sleeping as much as I like, I am bathing as much as I like; then eating as much as I like, sleeping as much as I like, bathing as much as I like, if dissatisfaction arises in me and passion assails the heart, I emit semen using my hand." || 1 ||

"But do you, reverend Seyyasaka, eat the gifts of faith[2] with the very same hand as that which you use to emit semen?"

"Yes, your reverences," he said.

Those who were modest monks became annoyed, vexed and angry, saying:

Seyyasaka's teacher is Lāludāyin, "an unsteady monk." This thera Lāludāyin is mentioned at *DhA*. ii. 123 as having the reputation of saying the wrong thing; at *Jā*. i. 123 as coming into conflict with Dabba the Mallian over food-tickets; and at *Jā*. ii. 164 as being extremely nervous and unable to talk.

[1] *bhesajjam karosi.*

[2] *saddhā-deyya, VA*. is silent, but *DhA*. i. 81, explains as *kammañ ca phalañ ca idhalokañ ca paralokañ ca saddahitvā dinnāni.*

"How can the venerable Seyyasaka emit semen in this way?"

Then these monks, having rebuked the venerable Seyyasaka in various ways, told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had the order of monks convened, asked the venerable Seyyasaka:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Seyyasaka, using your hand, emit semen?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying: "It is not fit, foolish man, it is not becoming, it is not suitable, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not right, it is not to be done. How can you, foolish man, emit semen using your hand? Foolish man, have I not uttered dhamma in many ways for the stilling of passion,[1] and not for the sake of passion, taught dhamma for the sake of being devoid of the fetters, and not for the sake of being bound, taught dhamma for the sake of being without grasping,[2] and not for the sake of grasping? How can you, foolish man, while dhamma is taught by me for the sake of passionlessness, strive after passion? How can you, while dhamma is taught for the sake of being devoid of the fetters, strive after being bound? How can you, while dhamma is taught for the sake of being without grasping, strive after grasping? Foolish man, have I not taught dhamma in various ways for the stilling of passion, taught dhamma for the subduing of conceit, for the restraint of thirst, for the elimination of attachment, for the cutting through the round of becomings, for the destruction of craving, for passionlessness, for stopping, for waning? Foolish man, have I not declared in various ways the destruction of the pleasures of the senses, declared the full understanding of ideas of the pleasures of the senses, declared the restraint

[1] =above, p. 35, except that in this second passage the lord is represented as speaking. *Cf. A.* ii. 34.

[2] *Anupādāna*, *sa-upādāna*.

of the thirst for pleasures of the senses, declared the elimination of thoughts of pleasures of the senses, declared the allaying of the fever of pleasures of the senses? Foolish man, it is not for the benefit of unbelievers, nor for increase in the number of believers, but it is, foolish man, to the detriment of unbelievers as well as of believers, and it causes wavering in some."

Then the lord having rebuked the venerable Seyyasaka [111] in various ways on account of his difficulty in maintaining his state . . . said:

" . . . Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

Intentional emission of semen is a matter entailing a formal meeting of the Order."[1]

Thus this course of training for monks was made known to the lord. || 2 || 1 ||

Now at that time, monks, having eaten abundant food, went to sleep, thoughtless and careless. While they were sleeping, thoughtless and careless, one of them emitted semen as the result of a dream. These were remorseful and said[2]: " The course of training made

---

[1] *Saṅghâdisesa*. *Cf. A.* ii. 242. *VA.* 522 says, *saṅgho ādimhi c' eva sese ca icchitabbo assâ ti saṅghâdiseso.* This explanation was noted by Childers: an offence to be dealt with by a *saṅghakamma* in the beginning, *ādi*, and in the remaining cases, *sesa*. See below, *Old Comy.'s* explanation which makes clear the first stage, the placing on probation; the second stage of sending back to the beginning of the probation; the third stage, the *mānatta* discipline; and the last stage, the rehabilitation. This type of offence is next in gravity after the Pārājikas. Because it cannot be settled by many people or by one man (*Old Comy.*) it therefore has to be settled by the Order, which presumably has to be convened for the purpose, as the above incident shows. Editor at *Vin. Texts* i. 7, n. 1, notes that, " these thirteen offences give rise to the various *saṅghakammas* . . . which are explained in detail in the third Khandhaka of the Cūḷavagga."

[2] These first sentences recur at *Vin.* i. 294. *Cf. Kvu.* 164 where the matter of this story formed the controverted point of one of the early debates on arahans.

known by the lord says that intentional emission of semen is a matter requiring a formal meeting of the Order; and because of a dream one of us (did this). Now is this intention permitted? What now if we have fallen into an offence requiring a formal meeting of the Order?" They told this matter to the lord. He said: "Monks, this was the intention, but it does not apply.[1] Monks, this course of training should be set forth:

Intentional emission of semen except during a dream is an offence requiring a formal meeting of the Order." ||1||

Intentional means: a transgression committed knowingly, consciously, deliberately.[2]

Semen means: there are* ten kinds of semen . . .

Emission means: the removal from the place is called emission.

Except during a dream means: setting the dream aside.

Offence requiring a formal meeting of the Order means: the Order places him on probation[3] on account of the offence, it sends him back to the beginning,[4] it inflicts the mānatta discipline,[5] it rehabilitates[6]; it is not many

---

[1] =above, p. 159, and see n. 1.

[2] =above, p. 126, and see n. 3.

[3] *parivāsaṃ deti. Cf. Vin.* ii. 7. Rules for monks placed on probation are given at *Vin.* ii. 31 ff. At *Vin.* ii. 40 Udāyin was placed on probation for one day, since he had concealed this first saṅghâdisesa for one day. See *Vin. Texts* ii. 384, n. 1, for the four principal kinds of probation, and for Seyyasaka's conduct. At *Vin.* i. 69 it is said that a person who was formerly an adherent of another sect and who asks for ordination should be put on probation for four months, and the measures to be taken for the proper carrying out of this step are stated. Valid and invalid proceedings are given at *Vin.* i. 320 ff.

[4] *I.e.,* of his probationary term. *Cf. Vin.* ii. 7. At *Vin.* ii. 34 rules for those thrown back to the beginning are given: they are the same as for those placed on probation.

[5] This appears to be much like being placed on probation, *cf. Vin.* ii. 35. At *Vin.* ii. 45 Udāyin underwent mānatta for six days. For the correct carrying out of this discipline see below, p. 328.

[6] The way in which a monk should ask for rehabilitation is given at *Vin.* ii. 39 and *cf.* below, p 328.

people, it is not one man; therefore it is called an offence which in the earlier as well as the later stages (requires) a formal meeting of the Order. A synonym for this class of offence is a work;[1] therefore, again, it is called (an offence which in the earlier as well as the later stages requires) a formal meeting of the Order.[2] || 2 || || **2** ||

[The whole of || **3** ||,* pp. 112-115, because of the outspokenness and crudeness which it contains, and which seem to be inseparable from early literatures, appears unsuitable for incorporation in a translation designed principally for Western readers.]

He aims at it, makes the effort, it is emitted—an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. He aims at it, makes the effort, it is not emitted—a grave offence. He aims at it, does not make the effort, it is emitted—not an offence. He aims at it, does not make the effort, it is not emitted—not an offence. He does not aim at it, he makes the effort, it is emitted—not an offence. He does not aim at it, does not make the effort, it is emitted—not an offence. He does not aim at it, does not make the effort, it is not emitted—not an offence.

There is no offence if he was dreaming, if there was no intentional emission, if he was mad, unhinged, in pain, a beginner. || **4** ||

A dream, excrement and urine, reflection, and about hot water,
Medicine, itching, the way, the bladder, a hot room for bathing-purposes, making an effort, /

[1] *kamma*, possibly meaning *saṅghakamma*: an act or ceremony, for the infliction of the penalty, to be performed by an assembly of monks met together in solemn conclave. Probably *kamma* has here an ancient technical meaning.

[2] *Cf. Vin.* iv. 225, the first Bhikkhunī-saṅghâdisesa. Here "inflicts mānatta" is apparently substituted for "places on probation," which is not mentioned.

And a novice, and asleep, the thigh, he pressed with the fists,
In the air, firmness, he meditated on, an aperture, he hit with a stick, /
In the stream, muddy water, running, a twist of flowers, a lotus,
Sand, mud, water, lying down, and with the thumbs.

At one time while a certain monk was dreaming he emitted semen. He was remorseful and said: " What now if I have fallen into an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order?" That monk told this matter to the lord. He said: " There is no offence for the monk because he was dreaming." || 1 ||

[The reasons for not including* the remainder of || **5** || in this translation are the same as those for not including || **3** || above.]

Told is the First Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order

FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHÂDISESA) II

AT one time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's park. At that time the venerable Udāyin lived in the jungle. The dwelling[1] of the venerable one was lovely, good to look upon, beautiful, the inner chamber in the middle was entirely surrounded by the house; the couch and chair, the bolster and pillow were well designed, the water used for drinking and that used for washing were well placed; the cell[2] was well swept. Many people came to look at the dwelling of the venerable Udāyin, and a certain brahmin together with his wife approached the venerable Udāyin, and having approached the venerable Udāyin, he said: "We want to see the dwelling of the good Udāyin."

"Do look at it, brahmin," he said, and taking the key, unfastening the bolt, and opening the door,[3] he entered the dwelling. The brahmin entered after the venerable Udāyin, and the brahmin lady entered behind the brahmin. Then the venerable Udāyin, opening some windows and closing others, going round about the inner room, and coming up from behind, rubbed up against[4] the brahmin lady limb by limb. Then the

---

[1] *Vihāra.* [2] *pariveṇa*, see above, p. 119, n. 1.

[3] *Kavāṭaṃ paṇāmetvā.* *Cf.* *Vin.* i. 87; ii. 114, 207 and *Vin. Texts* iii. 88, where in n. 1 translator (rightly) insists that *paṇāmeti* is "to open" and not "to shut." Our passage above is further evidence that this is so. But *P.T.S. Dict.* says "*kavāṭaṃ paṇāmeti*, to shut the door." Possibly it means "to make the door lean," *i.e.* when open against the wall, when closed against the post.

[4] *parāmasi*, see below, p. 203, and n. 6. This "rubbing up against" was not, I think, an act of deliberate familiarity or meant offensively. In the tiny cell-room Udāyin just rubbed up against the visitors, as we might rub up against people in a crowd —in a bus or train or queue.

brahmin, having exchanged greetings with the venerable Udāyin, went away. Then the brahmin, who was pleased, burst out with a cry of pleasure:[1] "Superb are these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, who dwell in such a jungle, superb is the revered Udāyin who dwells in such a jungle."

Having spoken thus, the brahmin lady said to the brahmin: [**119**]

"What is there superb about him? Even as you rubbed up against me limb by limb, so did this recluse Udāyin rub up against me limb by limb."

Then the brahmin became annoyed, vexed, angry and said:

"These recluses, sons of the Sakyans,[2] are shameless, of low morality, liars. And they pretend to be walking by dhamma, walking by right, leading the Brahma-life, speaking truth, virtuous, of good conduct. Among these there is no recluseship, among these there is no brahmanhood. Perished is recluseship among these, perished is brahmanhood among these. Where is recluseship among these? Where is brahmanhood among these? Fallen from recluseship are these, fallen from brahmanhood are these. How can this recluse Udāyin rub up against my wife limb by limb? It is not possible to go to the park or dwelling with wives of respectable families, with daughters of respectable families,[3] with girls of respectable families,[3] with daughters-in-law[4] of respectable families, with women-slaves of respectable

[1] *attamano attamanavācaṃ nicchāresi*=*M.* i. 32 and *M.* i. 509 *inicchāreyya*). *VA.* is silent. *MA.* i. 151 says: *attamano ti sakamano tuṭṭhamano ; pītisomanassehi va gahitamano. Attamanavācaṃ nicchārresî ti attamanatāya vācaṃ, attamanabhāvassa vā yuttavācaṃ nicchāresi. Udīrayi, pabyāharî ti vuttaṃ hoti.*

[2] As above, p. 125, and below, p. 223.

[3] These two are probably meant to be opposed. Bu. calls *kuladhītā, purisantaraṃ gatā*, and *kulakumāriyo, aniviṭṭhā* (unsettled).

[4] *Kulasuṇhā. P.T.S. Dict.* gives *suṇhā* under *suṇisa.* At *Vin. Texts* ii. 348 it is trans. "sisters-in-law." Childers gives daughter-in-law. *VA.* 532 says, "brought from another family for the young men of respectable families, they are *vadhuyo*," which is daughters-in-law. And indeed a daughter-in-law held a more important position in the social system than did a sister-in-law.

families. If wives of respectable families, daughters of respectable families, girls of respectable families, daughters-in-law of respectable families, women-slaves of respectable families should go to a park or dwelling, the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, may assault them." || 1 ||

The monks heard this brahmin as he was grumbling, murmuring, and becoming angry. Those who were modest monks became annoyed, vexed, angry and said: "How can the reverend Udāyin come into bodily contact with women-kind?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, for this reason, causing the Order of monks to be convened, asked the reverend Udāyin:

"Is it true as they say, Udāyin, that you came into bodily contact with a woman?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

Then the enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"It is not right, foolish man, it is not becoming, it is not suitable, it is not fit in a recluse, it is not proper, it is not to be done. How can you, foolish man, come into bodily contact with a woman? Foolish man, is not dhamma uttered by me in various ways for the sake of stilling passion, and not for the sake of passion . . . declared the allaying of the flames of the pleasures of the senses? It is not, foolish man, for the benefit of unbelievers. . . . Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

"Whatever monk, affected by desire,[1] with perverted[2] heart, should come into[3] physical contact with a woman,

---

[1] *Otiṇṇa*, as passive: possessed by. See *Old Comy.'s* explanation below in 2, 1. The translators in *Vin. Texts* i. 7, n. 2 say, "our word 'degraded' has often a very similar connotation." They render *otiṇṇa* by degraded. *Cf.* below, p. 215.

[2] *Vipariṇatena*, lit. changed. *Cf.* below, p. 215.

[3] *Samāpajjeyya*=*saṃ*+*āpajjati*, Sanskrit. *āpadyate*=*ā*+*pad*, to get into, to come into, to meet with. *Sam*+*ā* (as here) very often pleonastic. Although *samāpajjati* does not, in the above context,

holding her hand, or holding a braid of her hair, or rubbing against any one or other of her limbs: this is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order." ||2||1||

Whatever means: he who . . .

Monk means: . . . this is how monk is to be understood in this sense. [120]

Affected by desire means: infatuated, full of desire, physically in love with.[1]

Perverted means: the perverted heart is impassioned, the perverted heart is corrupt, the perverted heart is erring. And in this meaning it is to be understood that the perverted heart is impassioned.[1]

Woman means: a human woman, not a female yakkha, not a female departed one, not a female animal,[1] even a girl born on this very day, all the more an older one.[2]

Together with means: together.

Should come into physical contact means: it is called a transgression.[3]

---

necessarily imply deliberate action, coming into physical contact with a woman was nevertheless regarded as an offence of a serious nature, because the desires possibly resulting from such a contact had to be suppressed. For in a growing vogue of monasticism the majority of members were perhaps young and middle-aged men. *Cf.* below, p. 338.

[1] =below, p. 215.

[2] *Mahattarī.* This is comparative of *mahant.* The Sanskrit form is *mahatturā*, but Pali has -*ī*, after *therī.* Same definition occurs below, p. 332.

[3] *Ajjhācāra*, cf. *ajjhācarati* ($adhy-\bar{a}+\sqrt{car}$) to practise (something bad). Used in *Vin.* in the sense of a fault, a transgression; then in an erotical sense as above, and *cf.* below, p. 216. It could not there be used in sense of contact, for the speech, not the body, was at fault. *VA.* 533 says, "whatever is called physical contact (*cf.* 547, "offensive speech") according to that meaning it is a transgression." *Cf.* also *VA.* 213, "she, because of his transgression, became pregnant." *VA.* 19 says, "he disciplines body and speech through the restraint of transgressions of body and speech." At *Vin.* i. 63 we get *adhisīle sīlavipanno hoti ajjhācāre ācāravipanno*

The hand means: going up from the tip of the nail as far as the elbow.

Braid of hair means: nothing but hair,[1] or mixed with threads,[2] or mixed with garlands,[3] or mixed with gold coins,[4] or mixed with gold,[4] or mixed with pearls, or mixed with jewels.[5]

A limb means: setting to one side a hand and a braid of hair, what remains is called a limb. || 1 ||

Rubbing, rubbing up against, rubbing downwards, rubbing upwards,[6] bending down, raising up, drawing to, pushing back, holding back hard, taking hard hold of, the grasp, the touch.

Rubbing is called merely rubbed. Rubbing up

---

hoti atiditthiyā ditthivipanno hoti. Here *ajjhācāre* (indeclinable) means according to *Tr. Crit. Pali Dict.*, " in matter of conduct " as *adhisīle* means not " in the higher morality," but " as to a matter of morality." *Vin. Texts* i. 184, n. 1, points out that there Bu. says that *adhisīle* " is said with regard to offences against the Defeat and Formal Meeting rules, while *ajjhācāre* consists in offences against the minor rules of the Pātimokkha." But below, p. 211, " to come into physical contact," which above is called a transgression, is there (below) called a Formal Meeting offence.

[1] *I.e.*, unmixed with threads, *VA.* 533.

[2] *I.e.*, the hair mixed with threads of five colours.

[3] *I.e.*, with jasmine flowers, and so on.

[4] On *hirañña* and *suvaṇṇa* see above, p. 28. Here *VA.* 534 says that *hiraññamissa* means mixed with garlands and kahāpaṇas; and *suvaṇṇamissa* means mixed with golden *cīraka* and with *pāmaṅga.* Here *suvaṇṇacīraka* probably means gold threads or bands or fillets (*cf. Jā.* v. 197 where *suvaṇṇacīraka* seems to mean gold brocade). On *pāmaṅga*, *cf.* above, p. 77.

[5] With jewels strung on threads.

[6] These four words: *āmasanā, parāmasanā, omasanā, ummasanā* are all connected with *masati* from $\sqrt{mṛś}$. to touch. I have tried to give the force of the prefixes with *masati* by suitable prepositions. *ā* has force of " at," therefore *ā-masati*, to stroke at, touch at, although *ā* in itself denotes touch (contact) or a personal (close) relation with the object—so *P.T.S. Dict.* *Cf.* below, p. 211. *Parā-* means " over." Note the difference of *o* $<$ *ava* and *ut* in the third and fourth words. There are similar prefixes in some of the following words, meaning " down " and " up." *Parāmasati* at *Vin.* ii. 216 is trans. by " wipes " (at *Vin. Texts* iii. 291)—*i.e.*, wipes over, rubs over (the spoon and the dish). *Cf. parāmasati*, above, p. 199.

against is called moving from here and there. Rubbing downwards is called bringing down low. Rubbing upwards is called raising up high. Bending down is called lowering. Bending up is called raising up high. Drawing to is called pulling. Pushing back is called sending back. Holding back hard[1] is called holding back having taken hold of a limb. Taking hard hold of is called taking hold together with someone. Grasp is called merely taken. Touch means merely contact.

Offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order means: . . . therefore it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. || 2 || **2** ||

If there is a woman, and thinking her to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated, and rubs the woman's body with his body, rubs up against it, rubs it downwards, rubs it upwards, bends it down, raises it up, draws it to, pushes it back, holds it back hard, takes hold of it hard, grasps it, touches it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If there is a woman, and being doubtful, if the monk is infatuated, and rubs the woman's body with his body, rubs up against it . . . touches it, there is a grave offence.
If there is a woman, and thinking it to be an eunuch, if the monk is infatuated . . . grave offence.
If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a man . . . thinking it to be an animal, if the monk is infatuated . . . grave offence.
If there is an eunuch, and thinking it to be an eunuch, if the monk is infatuated, [121] and rubs the eunuch's body . . . touches it . . . grave offence.
If there is an eunuch, and being doubtful . . . thinking it to be a man . . . thinking it to be an animal . . . thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated, and rubs the eunuch's body . . . touches it, there is an offence of wrong-doing

If there is a man, and thinking it to be a man . . . doubtful . . . thinking it to be an animal . . . thinking it to be a woman . . . thinking it to be an eunuch,

---

[1] *abhiniggaṇhanā*, while merely "holding back" is *niggaṇhanā*. Also *cf.* next, *abhinippīḷanā* and *nippīḷanā*.

if the monk is infatuated and rubs the man's body . . . touches it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If there is an animal, and thinking it to be an animal . . . doubtful . . . thinking it to be a woman . . . thinking it to be an eunuch . . . thinking it to be a man, if the monk is infatuated and rubs the animal's body . . . touches it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

Beginning with one || 1 ||

If there are two women, and thinking the two women to be women, if the monk is infatuated and rubs the women's bodies . . . touches them, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If there are two women, and being doubtful whether they are two women . . . thinking them to be men . . . to be eunuchs . . . to be animals, if the monk is infatuated and rubs with his body the bodies of the two women . . . touches them, there are two grave offences.

If there are two eunuchs, and thinking the eunuchs to be two eunuchs, if the monk is infatuated and rubs their bodies . . . touches them, there are two grave offences.

If there are two eunuchs, and being doubtful of their being eunuchs . . . thinking them to be men . . . to be animals . . . to be women, if the monk is infatuated and rubs the bodies of the eunuchs . . . touches them, there are two offences of wrong-doing.

It there are two men, and thinking the two men to be men, if the monk is infatuated and rubs the two men with his body . . . touches them, there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are two men, and being doubtful of their being men . . . thinking them to be animals . . . to be women . . . to be eunuchs, if the monk is infatuated and rubs the two men with his body . . . touches them, there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are two animals, and thinking the two animals to be animals . . . doubtful . . . thinking them to be women . . . to be eunuchs . . . to be men, if the monk is infatuated and rubs the two animals with his body, there are two offences of wrong-doing. || 2 ||

If there are a woman and an eunuch, and thinking both to be women, if the monk is infatuated [122] and

rubs with his body . . . touches them, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If there are a woman and an eunuch, and being doubtful, if the monk is infatuated . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there are a woman and an eunuch, and thinking both to be eunuchs, if the monk is infatuated . . . there are two grave offences.

If there are a woman and an eunuch and thinking both to be men, if the monk is infatuated . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there are a woman and an eunuch, and thinking both to be animals, if the monk is infatuated . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there are a woman and a man, and thinking both to be women, if the monk is infatuated . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If there are a woman and a man, and being doubtful of both . . . thinking them to be eunuchs . . . to be men . . . to be animals, if the monk is infatuated . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there are a woman and an animal, and thinking both to be women, if the monk is infatuated . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If there are a woman and an eunuch, and being doubtful of both . . . thinking them to be eunuchs . . . to be men . . . to be animals, if the monk is infatuated . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there are an eunuch and a man, and thinking both to be eunuchs, if the monk is infatuated . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there are an eunuch and a man, and being doubtful of both . . . thinking them to be men . . . to be animals . . . to be women, if the monk is infatuated . . . there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are an eunuch and an animal, and thinking both are eunuchs, if the monk is infatuated . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there are an eunuch and an animal, and being doubtful of both . . . thinking them to be men . . . to be animals . . . to be women, if the monk is infatuated . . . there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are a man and an animal, and being doubtful of both . . . thinking them to be animals . . . to be women . . . to be eunuchs, if the monk is infatuated . . . there are two offences of wrong-doing.

Beginning with two || 3 ||

If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and rubs with his body the woman's article of dress (worn on the body[1]) . . . touches it, there is a grave offence.[2]

If there are two women, and thinking the two women to be women, if the monk is infatuated and rubs with his body an article of dress belonging to the two women . . . touches it, there are two grave offences. [**123**]

If there are a woman and an eunuch, thinking that both are women if the monk is infatuated and rubs an article of dress of both with his body . . . touches them, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there is a woman, thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and rubs his body with the woman's article of dress . . . touches it, there is a grave offence.

If there are two women . . . there are two grave offences.

If there are a woman and an eunuch . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there is a woman, thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and rubs (his) article of dress with the woman's article of dress . . . touches it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.[3]

---

[1] *Kāyapaṭibaddha*, or ornaments, *e.g.* rings, *VA*. 536, clothes and flowers, *VA*. 537. Whoso takes several women, encircling them in things to be worn, commits various offences. *Cf.* below, p. 218.

[2] *Cf. Vin.* iv. 214.

[3] *Ibid.*

If there are two women . . . there are two offences of wrong-doing.
If there are a woman and an eunuch . . . there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there is a woman, and thinking it is a woman, if the monk is infatuated and rubs the woman's body with something that may be thrown[1] (aside), there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If there are two women, and thinking that the two women are women, if the monk is infatuated and rubs the bodies of the two women with something that may be thrown (aside), there are two offences of wrong-doing.
If there are a woman and an eunuch, and thinking both are women, if the monk is infatuated and rubs the body of each with something that may be thrown (aside), there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and rubs the woman's article of dress with something that may be thrown (aside), there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If there are two women, and thinking that the two women are women, if the monk is infatuated and rubs an article of dress belonging to the two women with something that may be thrown (aside), there are two offences of wrong-doing.
If there are a woman and an eunuch . . . there are two offences of wrong-doing.
If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and rubs something he has thrown (aside) with something of the woman's which may be thrown (aside), there is an offence of wrong-doing.
If there are two women . . . there are two offences of wrong-doing.
If there are a woman and eunuch . . there are two offences of wrong-doing.

Told is the Monk Repetition || 4 ||

If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and the woman rubs the body of the monk with her body, rubs against it, rubs it down-

[1] *nissaggiya*, *cf.* p. 129. *VA.* 540, flowers and fruits; *cf. Vin.* iv. 214.

wards, rubs it upwards, bends it down, raises it up, draws it to her, pushes it back, holds it back hard, takes hard hold of it, grasps it, touches it; if desiring cohabitation, he exerts his body and recognises the contact, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If there are two women, and thinking them to be women, if the monk if infatuated and the women rub . . . and recognises the contact, there is an offence entailing two formal meetings of the Order. [124]

If there are a woman and an eunuch, and thinking both to be women, if the monk is infatuated and if both rub . . . and recognises the contact, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and the woman rubs with her body the monk's article of clothing . . . there is a grave offence.

If there are two women . . . there are two grave offences.

If there are a woman and an eunuch . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and the woman rubs the monk's body with her article of dress . . . there is a grave offence.

If there are two women . . . there are two grave offences.

If there are a woman and an eunuch . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and the woman rubs the monk's article of dress with her article of dress . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If there are two women . . . there are two offences of wrong doing.

If there are a woman and an eunuch . . . there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and the woman rubs the monk's body with something that may be thrown (aside), if desiring cohabitation, he exerts his body and recognises the contact, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If there are two women . . . there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are a woman and an eunuch . . . there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and the woman rubs the monk's article of dress with something that may be thrown (aside) . . . and recognises the contact, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If there are two women . . . there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are a woman and an eunuch . . . there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and the woman rubs with something that may be thrown (aside) something of the monk's that may be thrown (aside), if desiring cohabitation, he exerts his body but does not recognise the contact, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If there are two women . . . there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are a woman and an eunuch . . . there are two offences of wrong-doing. || 5 ||

If desiring cohabitation, he makes bodily exertion and recognises contact, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. If desiring cohabitation, he makes bodily exertion but does not recognise contact, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If desiring cohabitation, he does not make bodily exertion but recognises contact, there is no offence. If desiring cohabitation, he does not make bodily exertion nor recognises contact, there is no offence.

If desiring emission he exerts his body and recognises contact, there is no offence. If desiring emission, he exerts the body but does not recognise contact, [125] there is no offence. If desiring emission, he does not exert the body but recognises contact, there is no offence. If desiring emission, he does not exert the body and does not recognise contact, there is no offence. || 6 ||

There is no offence if it is not on purpose, not intentional, not knowing, not agreeing, if he is mad, unhinged, in pain, a beginner.[1] ‖ 7 ‖ **3** ‖

Mother, daughter, and sister, wife, and female yakkha, eunuch,
Asleep, dead, an animal, about a wooden doll,/
Pressing up to, a bridge, a road, a tree, and a boat, and a cord,
A stick, he disclosed the bowl,[2] in salutation, he exerted himself but did not touch.

Now at that time a certain monk stroked[3] a mother[4] for the sake of a mother's affection . . . a daughter for the sake of a daughter's affection . . . a sister for the sake of a sister's affection. He was remorseful, and said: "What now if I have fallen into an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order?" He told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Monk, this is not an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, it is an offence of wrong-doing." ‖ 1 ‖

Now at one time a certain monk came into physical contact with his former wife. He was remorseful . . .

"You, monk, have fallen into an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order." ‖ 2 ‖

Now at that time a certain monk came into physical contact with a female yakkha . . . with a eunuch. He was remorseful . . . "Monk, it is not an offence

---

[1] *VA.* 541 says that Thera Udāyin was the first offender, therefore there was no offence for him.

[2] *Cf. kavāṭaṃ paṇāmeti.* See p. 199, n. 3, above, and p. 213, below.

[3] *Amasi, see above,* p. 199, n. 4, and p. 203 n. 6. *Āmasi* is the word there trans. by "to rub," but there it seems to call for "to stroke."

[4] *VA.* 541 says "he strokes the mother's body, saying, 'she is my mother.'" In text *āmasi* (he stroked) is not followed by the acc. as is usually the case.

entailing a formal meeting of the Order, it is a grave offence." || 3 ||

Now at one time a certain monk came into physical contact with a sleeping woman. He was remorseful . . . "Monk, you have fallen into an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order."

At one time a certain monk came into physical contact with a dead woman. He was remorseful. "Monk, it is not an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, it is a grave offence."

Now at one time a certain monk came into physical contact with a female animal[1] . . . "Monk, it is not an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, it is an offence of wrong-doing."

Now at one time a certain monk came into physical contact with a wooden doll . . . ". . . an offence of wrong-doing." || 4 ||

Now at one time many women, pressing up to[2] a certain monk, led him about arm-in-arm. He was remorseful . . . "Did you consent, monk?" he said.

"I did not consent, lord," he said.

"It is not an offence, monk, as you did not consent," he said. || 5 || **[126]**

Now at one time a certain monk, being infatuated, shook the bridge[3] upon which a woman had ascended. He was remorseful . . . ". . . offence of wrong-doing." || 6 ||

Now at one time a certain monk seeing a woman whom he met on the way, was infatuated, and gave her a blow on the shoulder. He was remorseful . . . ". . . formal meeting of the Order." || 7 ||

---

[1] *tiracchānagatitthi*, see above, p. 47, n. 4.

[2] *sampīḷetvā*, pressing, pinching, or worrying.

[3] *VA*. 546, whether it is a bridge for one passenger, or for waggons, if he succeeds in shaking it or not, it is a *dukkaṭa*.

Now at one time a certain monk, being infatuated, shook the tree up which a woman had climbed . . . the boat in which a woman had embarked. He was remorseful . . . " . . . offence of wrong-doing." || 8 ||

Now at one time a certain monk, being infatuated, pulled a cord[1] of which a woman held (the other end). He was remorseful . . . " . . . grave offence," he said.

Now at one time a certain monk, being infatuated, pulled a stick of which a woman held (the other end). He was remorseful . . . " . . . grave offence," he said. || 9 ||

Now at one time a certain monk, being infatuated, greeted[2] a woman with his bowl. He was remorseful . . . " . . . grave offence," he said. || 10 ||

Now at one time a certain monk, infatuated by a woman who made reverence, raised his foot. He was remorseful . . . " . . . formal meeting of the Order," he said.

Now at one time a certain monk, saying: " I will take a woman," exerted himself but did not touch one. He was remorseful . . . " . . . offence of wrong-doing," he said. || 11 || **4** ||

Told is the Second Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order

---

[1] *rajjum āviñji.*

[2] *pattena paṇāmesi.* In " Table of Contents," p. 211, above, this appears as *pattaṃ paṇāmesi*, which at *Vin.* ii. 216 is " uncovered (or disclosed) the bowl." The trans. of this passage at *Vin. Texts* iii. 290 is not accurate; but it means " he presents the bowl with his right hand." In the above passage it is so curious that *patta* is in the instrumental, as against the more natural acc. that I am inclined to suspect that *añjaliṃ* should have been inserted—then meaning, " he raised his hands together with his bowl in respectful salutation of the woman." Thus this " greeting with the hands " would be balanced just below by " greeting with the feet." *Comy.* is silent. I think that there must be some confusion between *pattaṃ paṇāmeti* and *añjaliṃ paṇāmeti. Cf.* on *kavāṭaṃ paṇāmeti*, above, p. 199, n. 3.

FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHÂDISESA) III

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's park. At that time the venerable Udāyin lived in the jungle. The venerable one's dwelling was lovely, good to look upon, beautiful. At that time many women came to the park[1] in order to see the dwelling. Then those women approached the venerable Udāyin, and having approached him, they said to the venerable Udāyin:

"Honoured sir, we want to see the master's dwelling."

Then the venerable Udāyin, showing these women his dwelling and pointing out[2] the privies to them, spoke in praise, spoke in blame and begged and implored and asked and questioned and described and exhorted and abused. Those [127] women who had little fear of blame,[3] who were sly and who had no shame mocked at the venerable Udāyin, called out to him, laughed at him, made fun of him.[4] But those women who had shame, upon departing complained to the monks, saying:

"Honoured sirs, this is not suitable, it is not fitting, we should not wish this spoken about even by our husbands, to say nothing of master Udāyin."[5] || 1 ||

Then those who were modest monks became annoyed, vexed and angry and said:

---

[1] Oldenberg, *Vin.* iii. 274, suggests *araññaṃ agamaṃsu.*
[2] *ādissa=apadisitvā, VA.* 546.
[3] *chinnikā=chinnaottappā, VA.* 546.
[4] *uppaṇḍentî ti paṇḍako ayaṃ nâyaṃ puriso ti.*
[5] *Kiṃ pan' ayyena Udāyinā.*

"How can the venerable Udāyin offend women with lewd words?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion and in this connection had the company of monks convened and questioned the venerable Udāyin, saying:

"Is it true as is said, Udāyin, that you offended women with lewd words?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"It is not suitable, foolish man, it is not proper, it is not becoming, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is out of place, it is not to be done. How can you, foolish man, offend women with lewd words? Foolish man, is not dhamma uttered in various ways by me for the sake of passionlessness, not for the sake of passion . . . proclaimed for the allaying of the flames of pleasures of the senses? It is not, foolish man, for the benefit of unbelievers . . . and thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, affected by desire[1], with perverted heart,[2] should offend a woman with lewd words concerned with unchastity, as, for example, a youth to a young woman, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order." ||2||**1**||

Whatever means: he who . . .

Monk means: . . . this is how monk is to be understood in this meaning.

Affected by desire means: infatuated, full of desire, physically in love with.[3]

Perverted means: the perverted heart is impassioned, the perverted heart is corrupt, the perverted heart is erring. And in this meaning it is understood that the perverted heart is impassioned.[3]

Woman means: a human woman, not a female yakkha, not a female departed one, not a female animal[3]; she is

[1] See above, p. 201, n. 1. [2] See above, p. 201, n. 2.
[3] *Cf.* above, p. 202.

intelligent, competent to know good and bad speech, what is lewd and what is not lewd.[1]

Lewd speech means: speech connected with privies and with unchastity.

Should offend[2] means: it is called a transgression.[3]

As, for example, a youth to a young woman means: a lad to a young girl, a boy of tender age to a girl of tender age, a male enjoying sense-pleasures to a female enjoying sense-pleasures. [**128**]

Concerned with unchastity means: connected with unchaste things.[4]

A formal meeting of the Order means: . . . because of this it is called a formal meeting of the Order. || **2** ||

Pointing out the two privies he speaks in praise, and he speaks in blame, and he begs, and he implores, and he asks, and he questions, and he describes, and he exhorts, and he abuses.

He speaks in praise means: he extols, he praises, he commends . . .

He speaks in blame means: he curses, he reviles, he finds fault with . . .

He begs means: he says, " give to me, you are worthy to give to me."

He implores means: he says, " When will your mother be reconciled ?[5] When will your father be reconciled ? When will your devatās be reconciled ? When will there be a good opportunity, a good time, a good moment ? When shall I have sexual intercourse with you ?"

He asks means: he says, " How do you give to your husband ? How do you give to a paramour ?"

---

[1] =below, p. 337

[2] *obhāseyyā ti avabhāseyya . . . asaddhammavacanaṃ vadeyya.*

[3] *Cf.* above, p. 202, in expl. of *kāyasaṃsagga.*

[4] It is difficult to render into English the slight difference of meaning in the Pali: *methunupasaṃhitāhī ti methunadhammapaṭisaṃyuttāhi. Cf.* below, p. 226.

[5] *VA.* 548, " on the reconciliation of your mother I will indulge in sexual intercourse."

He questions means: he says, "They say that as you give to your husband so you give to your paramour."

He describes means: having asked, he says: "Give thus, giving thus you will become dear and beloved to your husband."

He exhorts means: not having asked, he says: "Give thus, giving thus you will become dear and beloved to your husband."

He abuses means: he says, "You are without sexual characteristics, you are defective in sex, you are bloodless, your blood is stagnant, you are always dressed, you are dripping, you are a deformed woman,[1] you are a female eunuch, you are a man-like woman, your sexuality is indistinct, you are a hermaphrodite.[2] || 1 ||

If it is a woman, if he is infatuated thinking her to be a woman, and if the monk, pointing out the two privies to a woman, speaks in praise, speaks in blame . . . abuses, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If there are two women, if he is infatuated thinking them to be women, and if the monk pointing out the two privies to the two women . . . it is an offence entailing two formal meetings of the Order.

If it is a woman and an eunuch, if he is infatuated thinking them both to be women, and if the monk pointing out the two privies to both . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing with an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. || 2 ||

If there is a woman, if he is infatuated thinking her to be a woman, and if the monk leaving out (talk on) the two privies to the woman, pointing out (any part) from below the collar bone to above the knee,[3] speaks in praise, and speaks in blame [**129**] . . . and abuses, there is a grave offence.

---

[1] *sikharaṇī—i.e.*, probably with certain defects of the pudendum.
[2] For these abnormalities, *cf.* same list at *Vin.* ii. 271.
[3] *Cf. Vin.* iv. 213.

If there are two women . . . there are two grave offences.

If there are a woman and an eunuch . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence. || 3 ||

If there is a woman, if he is infatuated thinking her to be a woman, and if the monk, pointing out (any part) from below the collar bone to above the knee to the woman, speaks in praise, speaks in blame . . . abuses, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If there are two women . . . there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are a woman and an eunuch . . . there are two offences of wrong-doing. || 4 ||

If there is a woman, if he is infatuated thinking her to be a woman, if the monk, pointing out an article of clothing[1] to the woman, speaks in praise . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If there are two women . . . there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are a woman and an eunuch . . . there are two offences of wrong-doing. || 5 ||

There is no offence if he is aiming at (explaining) the meaning,[2] if he is aiming at (explaining) dhamma,[2] if he is aiming at (explaining) the teaching, if he is mad, if he is a beginner.[3] || 6 || **3** ||

Red, thick and short, matted, shaggy and long, sown,
I hope the way is at an end, faith, about a gift, about
work.

---

[1] *Kāyapaṭibaddha, VA.* 549 says, " a garment or a flower or an ornament," so here not necessarily article of dress. *Cf.* above, p. 207.

[2] *atthapurekkhāra dhammapurekkhāra. Attha* and *dhamma* taken together are sometimes rendered " the letter and the spirit " as at *A.* i. 69; *cf.* " not-dhamma and not-aim " at *G.S.* v. 155. *VA.* 549 says of *attha°*, " telling the meaning of the words or reciting the commentary," and of *dhamma°*, " teaching or reciting the text (*pāḷi*).

[3] *VA.* 549 again says, Udāyin was the beginner.

At one time a certain woman was wearing a newly dyed blanket. A certain monk, being infatuated, said to this woman: "Sister, is that red thing yours[1] ?" She did not understand and said:

"Yes, master, it is a newly dyed blanket."

He was remorseful and said: "What now if I have fallen into an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order ?" He told this matter to the lord, who said:

"Monk, it is not an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, it is an offence of wrong-doing." || 1 ||

At one time a certain woman was wearing a rough blanket . . . said:

"Sister, is that thick, short hair[2] yours ?" She did not understand and said:

"Yes, master, it is a rough blanket" . . . ". . . offence of wrong-doing." || 2 ||

At one time a certain woman was wearing a newly woven[3] blanket . . . and said:

"Sister, is that your matted hair[4] ?" She did not understand and said:

"Yes, master, it is a newly woven blanket." He was remorseful . . . ". . . offence of wrong-doing." || 3 ||

At one time a certain woman was wearing a rough blanket . . . and said:

"Sister, is that stiff[5] hair yours ?" . . .

"Yes, master, it is a rough blanket" . . . ". . . offence of wrong-doing. || 4 ||

At one time a certain woman was wearing a mantle . . . and said:

---

[1] *lohita* is both "blood" and "red."

[2] *VA.* 550, *kakkasaloman ti rassalomaṃ bahulomaṃ.*

[3] *āvuta* seems to be derived from *āvayati*=*ā*+*vā*, to weave, a root which has been merged in *ā*+*vṛ* (*āvarati*), to string on, to fix on. *Āvuta* as "woven" is not given in the *P.T.S. Dict.*

[4] *VA.* 550, *ākiṇṇaloman ti jaṭitalomaṃ.*

[5] *VA.* 550, *kharaloman ti thaddhalomaṃ.*

"Sister, is that long hair yours?". . . ". . . offence of wrong-doing." || 5 || [130]

At one time a certain woman came along having had a field sown.[1] A certain monk being infatuated said to this woman:

"Well, sister, has there been some sowing[1]?" She, not understanding, said:

"Yes, master, only I have not closed[1] the furrow." He was remorseful . . . "Monk, there is no offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, there is an offence of wrong-doing." || 6 ||

At one time a certain monk seeing a female wanderer[2] on the road, and being infatuated, said to this female wanderer:

"I hope, sister, that there is a way at the end?"[3]

She, not understanding, said:

"Yes, monk,[4] you will follow it." He was remorseful . . . ". . . grave offence." || 7 ||

At one time a certain monk, being infatuated, said to a certain woman:

"You are faithful, sister, but you do not give to us what you give to your husband."

"What is that, sir?" she said.

---

[1] Note here the play of the three conjugations: (1) double causative, *vapāpetvā*, having had the sowing done, or having superintended it, (2) simple causative, *vāpitaṃ*, (3) radical verb *paṭi+vuttaṃ*= Sanskrit *praty-upta*, as noted by Oldenberg, *Vin.* iii. 274, and by Geiger, *Pali Gr.*, pp. 72, 147, and not *prati-vac*, as given in *P.T.S. Dict. Vapāpeti*, *vutta* and *vāpita* are given under *vapati*, to sow. Bu. at *VA.* 550, who naturally attaches the word to *vap*, to sow, has two explanations; one for *udakavappa*, another for *thūlavappa*.

[2] *paribbājikā*. At *Vin.* iv. 92 it is a *pācittiya* for a monk to give food to one, at *Vin.* iv. 285 for a nun to give a robe to one.

[3] Under *saṃsīdati* the *P.T.S. Dict.*, referring to this passage, takes it to mean that the way (*magga*) is at an end. Bu. at *VA.* 550 has another explanation; indeed, without him we could not understand these puns.

[4] Note that the female wanderer addresses the monk as *bhikkhu*, while laywomen say *ayya*, master, or *bhante*, honoured sir.

"Sexual intercourse," he said. He was remorseful . . . ". . . an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order." ||8||

At one time a certain monk, infatuated, said to a certain woman:

"You are faithful, sister, for you do not give us the highest gift."

"What is the highest gift, sir ?" she said.

"Sexual intercourse," he said. He was remorseful . . . ". . . an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order." ||9||

At one time a certain woman was doing some work. A certain monk, infatuated, said to this woman:

"Stand, sister, I will work" . . . "sit, sister, I will work . . . lie down, sister, I will work." She, not understanding . . . ". . . an offence of wrong-doing." ||10||**4**||

Told is the Third Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order

FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHÂDISESA) IV

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's park. At that time the venerable Udāyin was dependent on families, and approached many families. Now at that time there was a certain woman who was a widow, beautiful, good to look upon, lovely. Then the venerable Udāyin, rising early and taking his robe and bowl, came up to this woman's dwelling [131] and having come up he sat down on the appointed seat. Then this woman approached the venerable Udāyin, and having approached she greeted the venerable Udāyin and sat down to one side. As she was sitting to one side the venerable Udāyin rejoiced, pleased, gladdened, delighted this woman with talk on dhamma. Then this woman having been . . . delighted with talk on dhamma by the venerable Udāyin, said to the venerable Udāyin:

" Do say, honoured sir, what (will be) of use[1]; we are able to give to the master, that is to say, the requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings and medicine for the sick."

" It is not hard, sister, for us to come by those things, that is to say, the requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings, medicine for the sick. Give[2] what is hard for us to come by."

" What is that, honoured sir ?"

" Sexual intercourse," he said.

" (Will it be) of use,[3] honoured sir," she said.

" (It will be) of use, sister."

" Come, honoured sir," she said, and entering into an inner room, taking off her cloak, she lay back on the

---

1 *Yena attho. Cf. Vin.* iii. 210 for the same expression.

2 *Dehi.* The use of the imperative in such a connection is a very grave thing.

3 *Attho,* to balance *yena attho* above (?).

couch. Then the venerable Udāyin approached this woman, and having approached her he said:

"Who could touch this evil-smelling wretch[1]?" and he departed spitting.[2]

Then this woman became annoyed, vexed, angry and said:

"These recluses, sons of the Sakyans[3] are shameless, of low morality, liars. And they pretend to be those walking by dhamma, walking by right, leading the Brahma-life, speaking truth, virtuous, of good conduct. Among these there is no recluseship, among these there is no brahmanhood. Perished is recluseship among these, perished is brahmanhood among these. Where is recluseship among these? Where is brahmanhood among these? Fallen from recluseship are these, fallen from brahmanhood are these. How can this recluse Udāyin, having himself begged me for sexual intercourse, say: 'Who could touch this evil-smelling wretch?' and depart spitting? What is bad in me? What is evil-smelling in me? In what am I inferior to whom?"[4]

Other women became annoyed, vexed, angry and said: "These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are shameless . . . How can this recluse Udāyin, having himself begged this (woman) for sexual intercourse, say: 'Who could touch this evil-smelling wretch?' and depart spitting? What is bad in her? What is evil-smelling in her? In what is she inferior to whom?" || 1 ||

The monks heard these women who were annoyed, vexed and angry. Those who were modest monks became annoyed, vexed, angry and said:

---

[1] It is curious that *vasala* is in the masc. or neuter, but it obviously refers to the woman. Bu. sees it as a masc. here, *VA*. 551.

[2] *Niṭṭhuhitvâ ti kheḷaṃ pātetvā*, *VA*. 551; *cf*. *PvA*. 80, *kheḷan ti nuṭṭhubhanaṃ*. *Cf*. *Vin*. i. 271 where the *seṭṭhi's* wife spat out (*nuṭṭhuhitvā*) ghee into a spittoon. *Cf*. also *Jā*. i. 459. Forms of this verb are *niṭṭhubhati*, *nuṭṭhubhati* and *niṭṭhuhati*.

[3] As above, pp. 125, 200.

[4] *Kassâhaṃ kena hāyāmi*. *VA*. 551, "with regard to treasure, jewelry or beauty, to what other women am I inferior? Who is better than I am?"

"How can this venerable Udāyin speak in praise of ministering to sense-pleasures for self[1] in the presence of women-folk?"

Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord for this reason, on this occasion, having had the Order of monks convened, [132] questioned the venerable Udāyin, saying:

"Is it true as is said that you, Udāyin, spoke in praise of ministering to sense-pleasures for self in the presence of women-folk?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him saying:

"It is not right, foolish man, it is not becoming, it is not suitable, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is out of place, it is not to be done. How can you, foolish man, speak in praise of ministering to sense-pleasures for self in the presence of women-folk? Foolish man, is not dhamma preached by me in various ways for the stilling of passion . . . the allaying of the flames of sense-pleasures declared? It is not, foolish man, for the benefit of unbelievers . . . Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, affected by desire,[2] with perverted heart,[2] should speak in praise of ministering to sense-pleasures for self in the presence of women-folk, saying: 'Sister, this is the highest kind of ministration: that a woman[3] should minister to one like me, virtuous, of

---

[1] *Attakāmapāricariyāya*, *VA.* 551 says, *methunadhammasaṃkhātena kāmena pāricariyā kāmapāricariyā, attano atthāya kāmapāricariyā attakāmapāricariyā.* This passage is quoted at *VvA.* 11, where *atta° cariyāya* is called *gāmadhamme*—*i.e.*, low states, those belonging to the village. Note that the term *attakāma* could be used also with religious significance: see Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Buddhism* (Home University Library), second edition, p. 81, and *cf.* *G.S.* ii. 21, "he to whom the self is dear," and *K.S.* i. 102, "the soul-lover." See also *attakāmarūpa* at *Vin.* i. 350=*M.* i. 205= iii. 155. *MA.* ii. 236 and *Old Comy.* below give two quite different interpretations of *attakāma*, the one giving the higher and the other the lower meaning.

[2] *Cf.* above, pp. 201, 215.

[3] *Yā*, whoever, fem.

good conduct, leading the Brahma-life, in this fashion '[1] —meaning with what is connected with sexual intercourse—that is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order." || 2 || 1 ||

Whatever means: . . . (see Formal Meeting III. 2) . . . competent to know . . . what is lewd and what is not lewd.

In the presence of women-folk means: in the neighbourhood of women-folk, near women-folk.

Sense-pleasures for self means: sense-pleasures for self,[2] for the sake of self, desiring for self, ministering to self.

This highest means; this highest, this best, this foremost, this utmost, this most excellent.

She[3] means: a noble woman,[4] a brahmin woman, a merchant-class woman, a low-caste woman.[5]

One like me means: a noble man, a brahmin, a merchant-class man, a low-caste man.

Virtuous means: refraining from onslaught on creatures, refraining from taking what is not given, refraining from lying.[6]

Leading the Brahma-life means: refraining from sexual intercourse.[6]

Of good conduct means: he is of good conduct in respect of this virtue and in respect of this Brahma-life.

---

[1] *Etena dhammena.* It might also mean "according to this *dhamma*" (teaching), but that it does not here is apparent from the *Old Comy.'s* exegesis below.

[2] *Attakāman ti attano kāmam.*

[3] *Yā*, trans. above "a woman."

[4] *VA.* 552, "if it is said, 'I am a noble man, you are a noble woman, a noble woman is worthy to give to a noble man, because they are of the same caste,' it is not a saṅghâdisesa offence. But if you say, 'I am a noble man . . . you are worthy to give me sexual intercourse,' because you are speaking of things connected with unchastity, there is a saṅghâdisesa offence."

[5] Showing that the four castes were by now recognised.

[6] Corresponding to the first three Pārājika offences, with the addition of refraining from lying. Deliberate lying has appeared as a pācittiya offence and as a pārājika offence.

In this fashion means: with regard to sexual intercourse.

Should minister to means: should give pleasure to.

Connected with unchastity means: connected with unchastity.[1]

A formal meeting of the Order means: . . . because of this it is called a formal meeting of the Order. || **2** || [**133**]

If there is a woman, if he is infatuated thinking her to be a woman, and if the monk speaks in praise, in the woman's presence, of ministering to sense-pleasures for self, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If there are two women, if . . . thinking they are two women . . . there are two offences . . . a formal meeting of the Order.

If there are a woman and an eunuch, if . . . thinking them both to be women . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing with an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. || 1 ||

There is no offence if he speaks, saying: "Support[2] (us) with the requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings, medicine for the sick," if he is mad, if he is a beginner.[3] || 2 || **3** ||

How can a barren woman? (How) can I get a son,
and be dear? How can I be charming?
What may I give? With what shall I support
(you)? How can I go to a good bourn?

At one time a certain barren woman said to a monk dependent on (her) family: "How could I, honoured sir, bear (a child)?"

---

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 216.

[2] *upaṭṭhaha*, imp. of *upaṭṭhahati*, from *upa*+√*sthā*.

[3] *VA*. 552 again says that Udāyin was the beginner, and therefore there was no offence for him.

"For this, sister, give the highest gift."

"What is the highest gift, honoured sir?" she said.

"Sexual intercourse," he said.

He was remorseful . . . ". . . a formal meeting of the Order." || 1 ||

At one time a certain fertile woman said to a monk dependent on (her) family: "How could I, honoured sir, get a son?"

"For this, sister, give the highest gift . . . ". . . a formal meeting of the Order." || 2 ||

At one time a certain woman said to a monk dependent on (her) family: "How could I, honoured sir, be dear to (my) husband?" . . . "How could I, honoured sir, be charming?"

"For this, sister, give the highest gift" . . . ". . . a formal meeting of the Order." || 3 ||

At one time a certain woman said to a monk dependent on (her) family:

"What, honoured sir, may I give to the master?"

"The highest gift, sister," he said.

"What is the highest gift, honoured sir?"

"Sexual intercourse," he said. He was remorseful . . . ". . . of the Order." || 4 ||

At one time a certain woman said to a monk dependent on (her) family:

"With what can I, honoured sir, support the master?"

"With the highest gift, sister," he said.

"What is the highest gift, honoured sir?" she said . . . ". . . formal meeting of the Order." || 5 ||

At one time a certain woman said to a monk dependent on (her) family:

"How can I go to a good bourn, honoured sir ?"
"For this, sister, give the highest gift."
"What is the highest gift, honoured sir ?" she said . . .
" . . . formal meeting of the Order." || 6 || **4** ||

Told is the Fourth Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order [**134**]

FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHÂDISESA) V

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's park. At that time the venerable Udāyin was dependent on families at Sāvatthī, and he approached many families. When he saw a youth not (yet) a husband, or a young girl without a husband, he spoke in praise of the girl in the presence of the youth's parents, saying: "The young girl of that family is beautiful, good to look upon, lovely, she is learned, accomplished, wise, clever, energetic. This young girl is suitable for that youth."

These said: "They do not know us, honoured sir, nor who we are, nor to whom we belong. If, honoured sir, the master will induce them to give, we might convey this girl to this youth."

He spoke in praise of the youth in the presence of the girl's parents, saying: "The youth of that family is beautiful, good to look upon, lovely, he is learned, accomplished, wise, clever, energetic. That young girl is suitable for this youth."

They said: "They do not know us, honoured sir, nor who we are, nor to whom we belong, nor in what, as it were, is the girl's property.[1] But if, honoured sir, the master would beg, we might give this girl to that youth."

By this means he brought about the leading[2] of the bridegroom (to the bride's home), he brought about the

[1] Or, taking *vatthuṃ* as wrong reading for *vattuṃ*: "we should be ashamed (*kismiṃ viya*, *cf.* *VA.* 552) to speak thus for the girl('s sake)."

[2] *āvāha*, *VA.* 552, "The bringing of the youth from another family to the girl."

leading away[1] (from the bride's home), he caused marriages[2] to take place. || 1 ||

Now at that time the daughter of a certain woman who was formerly a courtesan was beautiful, good to look upon, lovely. Some disciples of Naked Ascetics coming from a distant village, said to the courtesan: "Lady, give this girl to our boy!"

She said: "Masters, I do not know you, nor who these are, nor to whom he belongs; and I will not give my only daughter to go to a distant village."

Some people said to these disciples of Naked Ascetics: "Masters, why did you come?"[3]

"Now we, masters, begged that courtesan for her daughter for our son; and she said, 'But, masters, I do not know you, nor who these are, nor to whom he belongs, and I will not give my only daughter to go to a distant village.'"

"Master, why did you beg the courtesan for her daughter? Certainly master Udāyin should be told, master Udāyin will induce her to give (her daughter)."

Then these [135] disciples of Naked Ascetics approached the venerable Udāyin, and having approached him, they said to the venerable Udāyin: "Now, honoured sir, we begged that courtesan . . . 'distant village.' It would be good, honoured sir, if the master could induce this courtesan to give her daughter to our boy."

Then the venerable Udāyin approached that courtesan, and having approached, he said to that courtesan: "Why did you not give your daughter to these (people)?"

"But, master, I do not know them, nor who they are, nor to whom he belongs, and I will not give my only daughter to go to a distant village."

---

[1] *vivāha*, *VA*. 553, "The sending out of the girl herself to another family."

[2] *vāreyāni*, text; *VA*. 553, *vāreyyan*, with v.l. *vāreyyāni*. *VA*. 553, "begging: give your girl to our boy, or settling the day, lunar mansion, astronomic law."

[3] *kissa tumhe āgat' attha?* Here *attha* is second pl. of *atthi*, from √*as*.

"Give her to them, I know them."

"If, honoured sir, the master knows them, I will give (her)," she said. Then this courtesan gave her daughter to these disciples of Naked Ascetics. ||2||

Then these disciples of Naked Ascetics, taking the young girl, for a month made use of her according to her lot as a daughter-in-law[1]; then afterwards they made use of her according to her lot as a female slave.[2] Then this young girl dispatched a messenger to her mother, saying: "I am wretched, I am miserable, I get no happiness. For a month they made use of me according to my lot as a daughter-in-law, now after that they are making use of me according to my lot as a female slave. Let my mother come for me, let her take me away."

Then the courtesan came up to the disciples of Naked Ascetics, and having come up, she said to these disciples of Naked Ascetics, "Masters, do not make use of this young girl according to her lot as a female slave, make use of this young girl according to her lot as a daughter-in-law."

They said: "We do not want anything to do with you,[3] we want to have to do (only) with a recluse. You go away, we do not know you."

Then this courtesan, being reproached by these followers of the Naked Ascetics, returned again to Sāvatthī. A second time this young girl dispatched a messenger to her mother, saying: "I am wretched . . . take me away." Then the courtesan approached the venerable Udāyin, and having approached him, she said to the venerable Udāyin:

"Honoured sir, it is said that the young girl is wretched, miserable, she gets no happiness. For a month they

---

[1] *I.e.*, *VA.* 553, they enjoyed what she cooked, and the meals she served.

[2] *I.e.*, working in the fields, throwing out sweepings, fetching water, etc.

[3] *Āhārūpahāro.* *VA.* 553 says, "taking and offering, getting and giving, nothing is taken or offered by us, buying and selling with you is not our custom."

made use of her according to her lot as a daughter-in-law, and now after that they are making use of her according to her lot as a female slave. Honoured sir, do say: 'Masters, do not make use of this young girl according to her lot as a female slave, make use of this young girl according to her lot as a daughter-in-law.' "

Then the venerable Udāyin approached these disciples of the Naked Ascetics, and having approached them, he said to these disciples of the Naked Ascetics:

"Masters, do not make use of this young girl according to her lot as a female slave, make use of this young girl according to her lot as a daughter-in-law."

They said: "We do not want anything to do with you; we want to have to do (only) with the courtesan. A recluse should be without occupation,[1] [136] the recluse will become a model recluse.[2] You go away, we do not know you."

Then the venerable Udāyin having been reproached by these disciples of Naked Ascetics, returned again to Sāvatthī. For a third time the young girl dispatched a messenger to her mother, saying: "I am wretched, take me away." For a second time the courtesan approached the venerable Udāyin . . . ". . . Do say: 'Masters . . . as a daughter-in-law.' "

He said: "When I went before, I was reproached by these disciples of the Naked Ascetics. Go yourself. I will not go." || 3 ||

Then the courtesan became annoyed, vexed, angry and said: "May this master Udāyin be wretched, may this master Udāyin be miserable, may this

---

[1] *Avyāvaṭa*, a rare word. *Cf. Jā.* iii. 65 and its v.ll. *ajhāvata*, *abyāvata*; *Jā.* vi. 188; *D.* ii. 141. At *Nd.* ii. 72 *appossukha=abyāvata anapekkha.*

[2] *Samaṇena bhavitabbaṃ, avyāvaṭena samaṇo assa sumano.* The word *sumano* has v.ll. *sumaṇo*, *susamaṇo*; *VA.* reads *sussamaṇo.* Expl. seems to show what is rare: that Oldenberg's text is faulty. No doubt the text could be emended: *samaṇena bhavitabbaṃ avyāvaṭeṇa* (*avyāvaṭo*) *samaṇo assa sussamaṇo*, but the elliptical construction is perhaps intentional, and shows a popular style, which does not, however, sound very well.

master Udāyin not find happiness, even as my girl is wretched, miserable, and finds no happiness because of her evil mother-in-law, because of her evil father-in-law, because of her evil husband." And then the young girl became annoyed, vexed, angry, saying: "May this master Udāyin be wretched, may this master Udāyin be miserable, may this master Udāyin not find happiness, even as I am wretched, miserable and find no happiness because of my evil mother-in-law, because of my evil father-in-law, because of my evil husband."

Even other women, unhappy with their mothers-in-law, unhappy with their fathers-in-law, unhappy with their husbands, denounced[1] him, thus: "May . . . be wretched . . . even as we are wretched, miserable, and find no happiness because of our evil mothers-in-law, because of our evil fathers-in-law, because of our evil husbands."

But those women who were happy with their mothers-in-law, with their fathers-in-law, and with their husbands, these prayed to[1] him thus: "May this master Udāyin be happy, may this master Udāyin be blest,[2] may this master Udāyin prosper,[3] even as we are happy, blest and do prosper because of our good mothers-in-law, because of our good fathers-in-law, because of our good husbands." || 4 ||

The monks heard some women denouncing, some women praying. Then those who were modest monks became annoyed, vexed, angry and said: "How can the venerable Udāyin act as a go-between?"[4] Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, for this reason, having had the company of monks convened, questioned the venerable Udāyin, saying:

---

[1] *oyācati* and *āyācati*. For *āyācati cf. D.* i. 240.
[2] *sajjito, Comy.* 553 says, "endowed with all means of livelihood, beautifully adorned."
[3] *sukhamedho.*
[4] *sañcarittaṃ samāpajjati.* For n. on *samāpajjati* see p. 201, n. 3.

"Is it true, as is said, Udāyin, that you acted as a go-between?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

Then the enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying: "How could you, foolish man, act as a go-between? That is not, foolish man, for the benefit of unbelievers . . . Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth: [137]

Whatever monk should act as a go-between for a woman with a man in mind or for a man with a woman in mind, whether as a wife or as a mistress, that is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order." || 5 || **1** ||

At one time many men of abandoned life[1] who were amusing themselves in a pleasure grove, sent a messenger to a harlot to say, "Come, we will enjoy ourselves in the pleasure grove."

She said: "Masters, I do not know you, nor who you are, nor to whom you belong; and I have many goods, I am well-to-do, and I will not go outside the city."[2] Then the messenger told this matter to the men of abandoned life. A certain man said to these men of abandoned life:

"Masters, why do you beg this harlot? Surely master Udāyin should be told. Master Udāyin will procure (her for you)."

When he had spoken thus, a certain lay-follower said to that man: "Do not speak like that, master; it is not right for recluses, sons of the Sakyans, to act like that. Master Udāyin will not do it."

When he had spoken thus, they said, "Will he do it, or won't he do it?" and they made a bet. Then these men of abandoned life approached the venerable Udāyin, and having approached him they said to the venerable Udāyin:

---

[1] *VA.* 533 calls them "abandoned with women," *itthīdhutta*, not necessarily leading the wild life of gambling or the wild life of drink—the other two of the three kinds of abandoned life.

[2] *bahinagarañ ca gantabbaṃ nâhaṃ gamissāmi.*

"Now we, honoured sir, amusing ourselves in the pleasure grove, sent a messenger to some harlot, saying, 'Come, we will enjoy ourselves in the pleasure grove.' She said: 'Masters, I do not know you, nor who you are, nor to whom you belong; and I have many goods, I am well-to-do, and I will not go outside the city.' It would be good, honoured sir, if the master would procure this harlot (for us)."

Then the venerable Udāyin went up to this harlot, and having come up he said to this harlot: "Why do you not go among these (men)?"

"Master, I do not know them . . . I will not go outside the city."

"Go among them," he said, "I know them."

"If, honoured sir, the master knows them, I will go."

Then these men of abandoned life, taking this harlot, went to the pleasure grove. || 1 ||

Then that lay-follower became annoyed, vexed, angry, saying: "How can master Udāyin act as a go-between for a temporary wife?"[1] The monks heard that lay-follower who was annoyed, vexed, angry. Those who were modest monks became annoyed, vexed, angry, saying: "How can the venerable Udāyin act as a go-between for a temporary wife?" Then these monks [138] told this matter to the lord.

"Is it true, as they say, Udāyin, that you acted as a go-between for a temporary wife?"

"It is true, lord," he said:

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying: "How can you, foolish man, act as a go-between for a temporary wife? It is not, foolish man, for the benefit of unbelievers . . . Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should act as a go-between for a woman with a man in mind, or for a man with a woman

[1] *Cf.* Buddhaghosa, who says at *VA.* 553-4 that *taṃkhaṇo* here means "for a short time"; thus *taṃkhaṇikā* may mean "a temporary wife" as in this Saṅgh. rule. See below p. 236, for explanation of the *Old Comy.*

in mind whether as a wife or as a mistress or even as a temporary wife, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order." ||2||**2**||

Whatever means: he who . . .

Monk means: . . . thus monk is to be understood in this meaning.

Should act as a go-between means: either sent by a woman he goes into a man's presence, or sent by a man he goes into a woman's presence.

For a woman with a man in mind means: he tells to a woman the mind of a man.

For a man with a woman in mind means: he tells to a man the mind of a woman.

As a wife[1] means: You will become a wife.

As a mistress means: You will become a mistress.

Even as a temporary wife[2] means: you will become a wife for the moment.[2]

Offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order . . . because of that it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. ||**3**||

Ten (kinds of) women: protected by the mother, protected by the father, protected by the parents, protected by the brother, protected by the sister, protected by the relations, protected by the lineage, protected by dhamma, with protection, protected by a stick.[3]

---

[1] *VA*. 554, "Speaking to a woman with a man in mind he speaks of being a wife. Speaking to a man with a woman in mind, he speaks of being a mistress. Further, speaking to a woman with a man in mind he speaks of wifehood, of the sure state of being a wife, of the low livelihood of a mistress, but saying this, he also says, 'they say you will become a wife.' In speaking to a man with a woman in mind he says, 'You will become a lord, a husband, you will become an adulterer.'"

[2] *Taṃkhaṇikā* and *muhuttikā* are practically synonymous.

[3] *M*. i. 286=*M*. iii. 46, gives the first five on this list, then *sassāmikā, saparidaṇḍā antamaso mālāguḷaparikkhittā*. *A*. v. 264 gives the first five, then *dhammarakkhitā* (with v.ll. to insert *gottarakkhitā*), *sassāmikā*, etc., as at *M*. i. 286; iii. 46. *VvA*. 72 follows the *Vin*. reading. *Cf*. *G.S*. v. 177, n. 2.

Ten (kinds of) wives: one bought with money, one kept for passion, a kept woman, one who receives clothes, one who provides water, one who takes off the pad (for the burden she carries on the head), the slave and wife,[1] the servant and wife,[1] the flag-brought,[1] the wife for the moment. || 1 ||

Protected by the mother means: the mother protects,[2] guards,[3] wields supremacy,[4] has her under control.[5]

Protected by the father means: the father . . . has her under control.

Protected by the parents means: the parents . . . have her under control.

Protected by the brother means: the brother . . . has her under control.

Protected by the sister means: the sister . . . has her under control.

Protected by the relations means: the relations . . . have her under control.

Protected by the lineage means: her own clans-people . . . have her under control.

Protected by dhamma[6] means: those regarding dhamma . . . have her under control.

With protection means: she is appropriated in the womb saying: "She is mine," even if she is betrothed.

Protected by the stick means: the stick is put by some

---

[1] For explanation see below, p. 238.

[2] *VA*. 555, "the mother lets her go nowhere."

[3] *Ibid.*, "she puts her in a place so (well) guarded that other people cannot see (her)."

[4] *Ibid.*, "restrains her from living in lodgings of her own choice, and overrules her."

[5] *Ibid.*, "Saying 'do this, do not do that.'" *Cf. M.* i. 214, where the expression *cittaṃ vasaṃ vatteti*, "has his heart under control," or, as at *Fur. Dial.*, i. 155, "is master of his heart."

[6] *VA*. 555, "neither lineage nor dhamma protects her, but she is protected by her own clans-people and by those regarding dhamma who, on account of one teacher, have gone forth belonging to one company." It is not the abstract but the concrete which protects her; people and not ideas, in fact, her co-religionists (*sahadhammikā*). This is an interesting heading as being a recognised kind together with nine others.

people, and whoever goes to such-and-such a woman says: "What a stick."[1] ‖2‖ [139]

Bought with money means: having bought (her) with money, he makes her stay.

Kept for passion[2] means: the dear one makes the dear one stay.[3]

A kept woman means: giving her wealth, he makes her stay.[4]

One who receives clothes means: giving a garment, he makes her stay.[5]

One who provides water means: having handled a bowl of water, he makes her stay.[6]

One who takes off the pad (for burdens she carries on the head) means: taking down the pad he makes her stay.[7]

A slave means: she is a slave and a wife.

A servant means: she is a servant and wife.[8]

Flag-brought means: a woman taken in a raid.[9]

A temporary wife means: a wife for a moment. ‖3‖

A man sends a monk saying: "Go, honoured sir, to such a one protected by the mother, and explain: 'He

---

[1] *ettako daṇḍo.*

[2] *VA.* 555, "kept for passion, means, he lives of his own free will for passion. Inasmuch as she is not only passionate, but a wife she is accepted by the man."

[3] *piyo piyaṃ vāseti.*

[4] *VA.* 555, "A country-woman comes to be a wife, having received the household implements."

[5] *Ibid.*, "receiving as much as a garment or cloak, a vagabond woman rises to be a wife."

[6] *Ibid.*, plunging their two hands into one pot of water, he says: "Joined like this water, so let them not be divided."

[7] *VA.* 555, "Someone who is a gatherer of firewood and so on, and taking the pad off her head, he keeps her in the house." In India the women put a coiled pad of cotton or some material or grass on their head, and then balance their burdens: brass vessels, long bunches of firewood, big round baskets and so on, on the pad.

[8] *Ibid.*, "She works in the house for wages. Somebody lives a household life with her—not satisfied with his own wife."

[9] *VA.* 556, "Having gone with the army erecting the flag, plundering another district, she is brought back. If anyone makes her his wife, she is called flag-brought."

says become the wife of such a one bought for money.' " If he accepts, examines and brings back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

A man . . . protected by the father, explain: . . . protected by a stick, explain . . . a formal meeting of the Order.

The steps in the composition

A man sends a monk saying: " Go, sir, to such and such a one protected by the mother, protected by the father and say: ' He says, become the wife of so-and-so bought with money.' " If he accepts . . . formal meeting of the Order.

A man . . . protected by the mother and protected by the parents . . . protected by the mother and protected by a stick . . . formal meeting of the Order.

A portion of the series

A man . . . " protected by the father and protected by the parents . . . protected by the father and protected by the mother " . . . formal meeting of the Order.

Told is the beginning of the contracted series

A man . . . " protected by a stick and protected by the mother . . . protected by a stick and with protection . . ." . . . formal meeting of the Order.

Told is that beginning with one

That beginning with two and that beginning with three up to that beginning with nine should be done in the same way. This is that beginning with ten:

A man sends a monk saying: " Go, sir, to such a one protected by the mother and protected by the father . . and protected by a stick, and explain: ' He says, become . . . ' " . . . a formal meeting of the Order.

Told is the series about women bought with money || 4 ||

A man sends a monk, saying: " Go, honoured sir, to such a one protected by the mother, and explain: ' He says, become the wife kept for passion of such a man . . . the kept woman . . . the temporary wife.' " If he accepts . . . a formal meeting of the Order.

A man sends a monk, saying: " Go, honoured sir, to such a

woman [140] protected by the mother and protected by the father . . . and protected by a stick, and explain: '. . . a temporary wife.'" If he accepts . . . formal meeting of the Order.

Told is the series on the woman who is a temporary wife || 5 ||

A man sends a monk saying: "Go, honoured sir, explain to so-and-so protected by the mother: 'He says, become the wife bought by money of such and such a man.'" If he accepts, examines her, brings back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

A man . . . 'the wife kept for passion' . . . 'the kept woman' . . . 'the temporary wife' . . . formal meeting of the Order.

The steps of composition

This is that beginning with ten:

A man sends a monk, saying: "Go, honoured sir, explain to so-and-so protected by a stick: 'He says, become the wife of so-and-so, bought by money, and kept for passion and . . . and the temporary wife'" . . . formal meeting of the Order. || 6 ||

A man sends a monk saying: "Go, honoured sir, explain to so-and-so protected by the mother: 'It is said, become the wife bought by money of so-and-so.'" . . . a formal meeting of the Order.

A man . . . "to so-and-so protected by the mother and protected by the father, explain: 'It is said, become the wives and so-and-so, bought by money and kept for passion, and . . .'" . . . a formal meeting of the Order.

A man . . . "to so-and-so protected by the mother and protected by the father and protected by the parents, and explain: 'He says, become the wives of so-and-so, bought with money, and kept for passion, and the kept woman and . . .'" . . . a formal meeting of the Order.

Increase from both (ends) is to be made thus:

A man sends a monk saying: "Go, honoured sir, to so-and-so protected by the mother and protected by the father and . . . and protected by a stick and explain: 'He says, become the wives of so-and-so, bought by money, and kept for passion . . . and temporary wives.'" . . . a formal meeting of the Order.

Told is the increase from both (ends) || 7 ||

The mother of a man sent a monk . . . the father of a man sent a monk . . . the parents of a man sent a monk . . . the brother of a man sent a monk . . . the sister of a man sent a monk . . . the relations of a man sent a monk . . . the clansmen of a man sent [**141**] a monk . . . the co-religionists of a man sent a monk. || 8 ||

The mother of (a girl) protected by the mother sent a monk, saying: " Go, honoured sir, explain to so-and-so: 'Let her be the wife, bought by money, of so-and-so . . . ' " . . . formal meeting of the Order.

The mother of (a girl) protected by the mother sent a monk, saying: " Go, honoured sir . . . be the wife kept for passion . . . the temporary wife . . ." . . . a formal meeting of the Order.

The steps in the composition

This is that beginning with ten:

The mother of (a girl) protected by the mother sent a monk, saying: " Go, honoured sir, explain to so-and-so: 'Let her be the wife of so-and-so bought by money and the wife kept for passion and . . . and the temporary wife . . .' " . . . a formal meeting of the Order. || 9 ||

The father of (a girl) protected by the father sent a monk . . . the parents of (a girl) protected by the parents sent a monk . . . the brother of (a girl) protected by the brother sent a monk . . . the sister of (a girl) protected by the sister sent a monk . . . the relations of (a girl) protected by the relations sent a monk . . . the co-religionists of (a girl) protected by dhamma sent a monk . . . one who was appropriated with protection sent a monk . . . one who has put a stick, for protection with a stick, sent a monk, saying: " Go, honoured sir, explain to so-and-so: 'Be the wife of so-and-so bought with money . . . be the wife of so-and-so bought with money and the wife kept for passion . . . and the temporary wife.' " . . . a formal meeting of the Order. || 10 ||

One protected by the mother sent a monk, saying: " Go, honoured sir, explain to so-and-so: 'I am the wife bought by money for so-and-so . . . ' " . . . a formal meeting of the Order.

One protected by the mother . . . 'the wife kept for passion . . . the temporary wife' . . . formal meeting of the Order.

The steps of composition

If one protected by a stick sends a monk, saying: " Go, sir, explain to so-and-so: 'I am the wife for so-and-so, bought with

money . . . another wife kept for passion and . . . and the temporary wife.' " If he accepts, examines, and brings back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

Told is the whole abbreviated series || 11 ||

If he accepts, examines, brings back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. [142] If he accepts, examines, but does not bring back, it is a grave offence. If he accepts, but does not examine and does not bring back, it is an offence of wrong-doing. If he does not accept, but examines and brings back, it is a grave offence. If he does not accept, but examines, yet does not bring back, it is an offence of wrong-doing. If he does not accept, and does not examine, but brings back, it is an offence of wrong-doing. If he does not accept, does not examine and does not bring back, it is not an offence. || 12 ||

If a man enjoins many monks, saying: " Go, honoured sirs, examine such and such a woman," and if they all accept, all examine and all bring back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order for them all.

If a man . . . " . . . examine such and such a woman," and if they all accept, all examine, but if one makes them bring back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order for them all.

If a man . . . " . . . examine such and such a woman," if all accept, if one makes them examine her and if all bring back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order for them all.

If a man . . . " . . . examine such and such woman," if all accept, but if one makes them examine, and if one makes them bring back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order for them all. || 13 ||

A man enjoins a monk: " Go, honoured sir, examine such and such a woman." If he accepts, examines her and brings back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

A man enjoins a monk: " Go, honoured sir, examine such and such a woman." If he accepts, examines her but makes a novice

bring back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

A man enjoins a monk: " . . . such and such a woman." If he accepts, makes a novice examine, but himself brings back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

A man enjoins a monk: " . . . such and such a woman." If he accepts, makes a novice examine her, and the novice having examined, brings back alone,[1] there is a grave offence for both.[2] || 14 ||

Going, he procures, coming back he deceives with words—it is a grave offence. Going he deceives with words, coming back he procures—it is a grave offence. Going he procures, coming back he procures—it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. || 15 ||

There is no offence if it is for the Order,[3] or for a shrine,[4] or if he is ill;[5] if he is going on business, if he is mad, if he is a beginner. || 16 || **4** ||

Asleep, and dead, gone out, unsexed woman, a female eunuch,
She was reconciled after having quarrelled, and did go-between for a eunuch.

---

[1] *bahiddhā*, not telling his teacher, the monk.

[2] *VA.* 559, "A grave offence for both means: the accepting, and making over the examining is a grave offence with two parts for the teacher. The accepting and the bringing back is a grave offence with two parts for the novice."

[3] *VA.* 599 f., "It is not an offence if any hall for reciting the Pāṭimokkha belonging to the Order is left unfinished, and a lay-follower sends a monk to a female lay-follower in order to get food as wages for the workers, or if a female lay-follower goes to a lay-follower on business connected with the Order. It is the same for building a shrine."

[4] I do not think a *cetiya* is necessarily a "tumulus, sepulchral monument, cairn," as the *P.T.S. Dict.* defines it. The *cetiyas* at, *e.g.*, the Caves of Ellora and Ajanta are certainly neither tumuli nor cairns, nor do they contain relics. Erected probably after the life-time of the Buddha, they were used as places for meditation, ($\sqrt{cet}$, to think), or for listening to discourses. See below, p. 266.

[5] "If he goes for the sake of medicine for an invalid, sent by a lay-follower into the presence of a female lay-follower, or sent by a female lay-follower into the presence of a male lay-follower."

At one time a certain man [**143**] enjoined a certain monk: " Go, honoured sir, examine such and such a woman." As he was going, he asked some people: " Where is so-and-so ?"

" She is asleep, honoured sir," they said. He was remorseful, and said: " What now if I have fallen into an offence requiring a formal meeting of the Order." He told this matter to the lord. He said: " Monk, this is not an offence requiring a formal meeting of the Order; it is an offence of wrong-doing." || 1 ||

At one time a certain man enjoined a certain monk, saying: " Go, honoured sir, examine such and such a woman." As he was going he asked some people: " Where is so-and-so ?" " She is dead, honoured sir," they said. . . . " She has gone out, honoured sir," they said. . . . " That is an unsexed woman, honoured sir." . . . " That is a female eunuch,[1] honoured sir," they said. He was remorseful . . . " offence of wrong-doing." || 2 ||

At one time a certain woman, having quarrelled with her husband, went to her mother's house. A monk, dependent on (her) family, effected a reconciliation. He was remorseful . . .

" Monk, is she not one to be told ' enough ' ?"[2]

" She is not one to be told ' enough,' lord."

" It is not an offence, monk, as she is not one to be told ' enough '." || 3 ||

---

[1] *Itthipaṇḍakā*, may be name of a deformity. *Cf.* above, p. 217; and *Vin.* ii. 271 (°*paṇḍikā*).

[2] *alaṃvacanīyā*, a woman who has to be addressed with *alaṃ* (enough), perhaps the husband's way of divorcing, and the wife returns to her parental home. That this woman did not return to the parental home, *nâlaṃvacanīyā*, means, according to Bu., *VA*. 561, " she was not abandoned (by her husband). For any woman who is abandoned according to the customs of divers districts and thus ceases to be a wife, is called *alaṃvacanīyā*. But this woman was not one to be told ' enough ' (perhaps = divorce) on account of some quarrel, so that here the lord said there was no offence."

At one time a certain monk acted as a go-between for a eunuch. He was remorseful. "What now if I have fallen into an offence requiring a formal meeting of the Order?" He told this matter to the lord.

"Monk, it is not an offence requiring a formal meeting of the Order; it is a grave offence." ‖ 4 ‖ **5** ‖

Told is the Fifth Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order

FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHÂDISESA) VI

. . . at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding place. At that time the monks of Āḷavī,[1] begging in company,[2] were having huts built with no benefactor,[3] for their own advantage, and not according to measure[4]; but these were not finished. They lived intent on begging, intent on hinting[5]: "Give a man, give a servant, give an ox, give a wagon, give a knife, give a hatchet, give an axe, give a spade, give a chisel, give a creeper, give bamboo, give *muñja*-grass, give coarse grass, give *tiṇa*-grass, give clay." People were oppressed with the begging, oppressed with the hinting, and when they saw the monks they were perturbed, then alarmed, then they ran away, then they went by a different route,[6] turned in another direction[7] and closed the door; and when they saw cows they ran away, [**144**] imagining them to be monks.

---

[1] *VA.* 561, "boys born in the kingdom of Āḷavī were called Āḷavakā, and at the time of their going forth they were known as Āḷavakā." These monks often gave trouble over new buildings, *cf.* above, p. 148, and *Vin.* ii. 172.

[2] Oldenberg says, *Vin.* iii. 274, "probably we ought to read constantly *saṃyācikāya kuṭiyo*." *VA.* 566 takes *saŋyācikāya* to mean begging themselves. See below, p. 254.

[3] *Assāmikāyo ti anissariyo*, *VA.* 561, which goes on to say, "having them built without a donor," or benefactor, *dāyaka*.

[4] *Appamāṇikāyo. VA.* 561, "with this amount they will be completed," they said. So they were not limited in size, their measure increased, their measure was great.

[5] See *Vin.* iii. 227.

[6] *VA.* 565, "having come to a road, then leaving it and turning back, they went taking the left side or the right."

[7] *Aññena mukhaṃ karoti*: to direct the face towards another (quarter).

Then the venerable Kassapa the Great[1] arose from spending the rains in Rājagaha, and set out for Āḷavī. In due course he arrived at Āḷavī. There the venerable Kassapa the Great stayed in the chief shrine at Āḷavī.[2] Then the venerable Kassapa the Great rising early, and taking his bowl and robes, entered Āḷavī for alms. People seeing the venerable Kassapa the Great were perturbed, then alarmed, then they ran away, then they went by a different route, turned in another direction and closed the door. Then the venerable Kassapa the Great, having walked Āḷavī for alms, after having eaten and finished his meal, addressed the monks saying:

"Formerly, your reverences, Āḷavī had good alms-food, alms were easily obtained, it was easy to keep oneself going by gleaning or by favour. But now this Āḷavī is short of alms-food, alms are difficult to obtain, nor is it easy to keep oneself going by gleaning or by favour. What is the reason, what the cause that now this Āḷavī is short of alms-food, that alms are difficult to obtain, that it is not easy to keep oneself going by gleaning or by favour?"

---

[1] *Mahā*. The rendering "Great" is perhaps a little misleading, for one would not think him eminent enough to be so called. The epithet was clearly given so as to distinguish him from other Kassapas. Conceivably it means that he had been in the Order longer than they had. We cannot say the "Elder" as *thera* is an elder; but Kassapa Senior might be possible. Further, I think it doubtful whether it is right to render *Mahā* as "Great" in any of the cases where it occurs as an epithet of disciples. For example, Sāriputta was never called Mahā-Sāriputta, as Moggallāna was referred to, very frequently, as Mahā-Moggallāna; and yet as far as "greatness" goes, there is little or nothing to choose between them.

[2] *Aggāḷave cetiye*, mentioned at *Vin*. ii. 172; *S*. i. 185; *Sn*. p. 59; *DhA*. iii. 170. *SnA*. 344=*SA*. i. 268 explains *aggāḷave cetiye* as *Āḷaviyaṃ aggacetiye*, and says that it was transformed into a vihāra. At *K.S*. i. 234, it is taken to be "the chief temple" at Āḷavī; in *Buddhist Suttas*, p. 56 (second edition), it is called "the temple at Aggāḷava"; while translator at *Vin. Texts* iii. 212 appears to regard it as a proper name. Mr. E. M. Hare in *G.S*. iv. 147 translates, "at Aggāḷava, near the shrine there," and gives no notes. It was probably a pre-Buddhist shrine. See above, p. 243, n. 4, and below, p. 266, n. 5. Also see B. C. Law, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, Appendix, p. 74 ff.

Then these monks told this matter to the venerable Kassapa the Great. || 1 ||

Then the lord having dwelt at Rājagaha for as long as he thought fit, set out on a tour for Āḷavī. Making the tour, in due course he arrived at Āḷavī. There at Āḷavī the lord dwelt in the chief shrine at Āḷavī. Then the venerable Kassapa the Great approached the lord, and having approached him, he greeted the lord and sat down to one side. Sitting to one side the venerable Kassapa the Great told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on that occasion, for that reason, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the monks of Āḷavī, saying:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, begging in company, were having huts built, with no benefactor, for your own advantage, not according to measure, and that these were not completed? They say that you dwelt intent on begging, intent on hinting: 'Give a man . . .' . . . seeing cows they ran away, taking them for monks."

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "How can you, foolish men, begging in company, have huts built? . . . 'Give a man . . . give clay.' It is not foolish men, for the benefit of unbelievers," . . . having rebuked them and given dhamma-talk, he addressed the monks: || 2 ||

"Formerly,[1] monks, two brothers (who were) holy men[2] lived close by the river Ganges. Then, monks, Maṇikaṇṭha,[3] [145] the nāga-king,[4] emerging from the

[1] *Cf. Jā.* ii. 283, Maṇikaṇṭhajātaka, for this story.

[2] *Isi*, holy man or anchorite. *Isi* has not the great force of *ṛṣi* of the brahminical tradition, meaning a seer or inspired singer to whom the Vedas were spoken or revealed. There are interesting variations in the details of this story as described in *Vin.* and *Jā.*

[3] *VA.* 565, "the nāga-king went with a very valuable jewel able to grant all desires, adorning his throat, therefore he is called 'jewel-throated.'" *Cf.* Hindu mythology, where the cow granting all desires and the jewel granting all desires were brought out from the sea at the Churning of the Ocean.

[4] Or serpent-king.

river Ganges, came up to the younger holy man, and having come up and encircled the younger holy man seven times with his coils, he stood spreading his great hood above his head.[1] Then, monks, the younger holy man, through fear of this snake, became thin, wretched, of a bad colour, yellowish, his veins showing all over his body. Monks, the elder holy man saw that the younger holy man was thin, wretched, of bad colour, yellowish, the veins showing all over his body. Seeing this, he said to the younger holy man: 'Why are you, good sir, thin . . . all over your body?'

'Now, the nāga-king, Maṇikaṇṭha, came out of the river Ganges for me, and came up to me, and having come up and having encircled me seven times with his coils, he stood spreading his great hood above my head.[1] I, good sir, through fear of the snake, became thin . . . all over my body.'

'But, good sir, do you not want this snake to return?'

'Good sir, I do not want this snake to return.'

'Do you, good sir, see anything of this snake?'

'I see, good sir, the jewelled ornament on his throat.'

'Then, good sir, you beg this snake for the jewel, saying: "Good sir, give me the jewel; I want the jewel."'

Then, monks, Maṇikaṇṭha, the nāga-king, emerging from the river Ganges, came up to the younger holy man and having come up he stood to one side. Monks, as he was standing to one side, the younger holy man said to Maṇikaṇṭha, the nāga-king: 'Good sir, give the jewel to me, I want the jewel.' Then Maṇikaṇṭha, the nāga-king, said: 'A monk begs for the jewel, a monk wants the jewel,' and he hurried away.

A second time, monks, did Maṇikaṇṭha emerging . . . come up to the younger holy man. Then, monks, the younger holy man saw Maṇikaṇṭha, the nāga-king, coming from afar, and seeing Maṇikaṇṭha, the nāga-

[1] *I.e.*, according to *VA.* 565, above the younger holy man's head. He was practising *mettā-vihāra*, and the nāga-king shaded him with his hood.

king, he said: 'Good sir, give me the jewel, I want the jewel.' Then, monks, Maṇikaṇṭha, the nāga-king, said: 'A monk begs for the jewel, a monk wants the jewel.' And then he turned away again.

A third time, monks, Maṇikaṇṭha, the nāga-king, came up from the river Ganges. Then, monks, the younger holy man saw Maṇikaṇṭha, the nāga-king, emerging from the river Ganges, and seeing him, he said to Maṇikaṇṭha, the nāga-king: 'Good sir, give me the jewel, I want the jewel.' Then, monks, Maṇikaṇṭha, the nāga-king, addressed these verses to the younger holy man: [**146**]

> 'My food and drink is produced abundantly, excellently—by reason of this jewel,
> I do not give it to you, you are one who asks too much, and not for you will I come to a hermitage.
> Like a lad, his hand on a tempered sword,[1] you frighten[2] (me) begging for this stone,[3]
> I do not give it to you, you are one who asks too much, and not for you will I come to a hermitage.'

Then, monks, Maṇikaṇṭha, the nāga-king, said: 'A monk begs for the jewel, a monk wants the jewel,' and he went away; then he was gone, and did not come back

---

[1] *sakkharadhotipāṇi*. *Jā*. ii. 285 expl. "your hand is on a sword polished on the oil-(whetting) stone." *VA*. 566 says: *sakkharā vuccati kāḷasilā* (a dark stone) . . . *sakkharadhotapāṇi, pāsāṇe dhotanisitakhaggahattho ti attho*, which seems to mean "in the hand the sword whetted and cleaned on a stone." "As a man with a hand on a sword frightens, do you frighten begging me for the stone." *Ibid*., Rouse translates this line at *Jā*. ii. 198: "Like lads who wait with tempered sword in hand" (lads, *susū* being there in the pl.).

[2] *tāsesi*, caus. of *tasati*, to tremble, shake, to have fears.

[3] Reading with *Jā*., *tāses' imaṃ selaṃ yācamāno*, and not with *Vin*., *tāsesi maṃ* . . . *Jā. Comy*. says (*Jā*. ii. 285): "asking for this jewel, you frighten me like a young man who would unsheathe his gold-hilted sword and say: 'I cut off your head.'" *VA*. 566 reads, *evaṃ tāsesi maṃ selaṃ yācamāno, maṇiṃ yācanto ti attho*.

again. Then, monks, the younger holy man, not seeing that beautiful snake, became increasingly thin, wretched, of a bad colour, yellowish, the veins showing all over his body. The elder holy man, seeing that the younger holy man had become increasingly thin . . . the veins showing all over his body, said to the younger holy man:

'Why are you, good sir, increasingly thin . . . the veins showing all over your body?'

'It is because I, good sir, do not see the beautiful snake that I become increasingly thin . . . the veins showing all over my body.'

Then, monks, the elder holy man addressed these verses to the younger holy man:

> 'Do not beg him who is dear for what you covet, it is odious to ask for too much,
> The snake, begged by a brahmin for a jewel, disappeared, and was not seen (again).'[1]

Monks, begging from these animals and living creatures will become hated, begging by hinting (will become) hated, how much more then (will be begging) from men? || 3 ||

Once upon a time, monks, a certain monk lived in a certain thicket on a slope of the Himâlayas. Monks, not far from the thicket was an extensive, low-lying marshy ground. Then, monks, a great flock of birds, going daily to feed in this marshy ground, entered the thicket at night to roost. Then, monks, that monk, worried by the noise of the flocking birds, came up to me, and having come up and greeted me, he sat down to one side. Sitting to one side, I said, monks, to that monk: **[147]** 'I hope, monk, you are getting on well, I hope, monk, you are keeping going, having accomplished your journey with but little fatigue. But where do you come from, monk?'

'I am getting along fairly well, lord,[2] I am keeping going, lord,[2] and, lord,[3] I have accomplished my journey

[1] =*Jā.* ii. 285. [2] *Bhagavā.* [3] *Bhante.*

with but little fatigue. There is, lord,[1] on the slopes of the Himâlayas a large thicket, and, lord, not far from this thicket there is an extensive, low-lying marshy ground. Now, lord, a great flock of birds going daily to feed at that marshy ground goes into that thicket at night to roost. That is why I come, lord,[2] for I am worried by the noise of that flock of birds.'

I said: 'Monk, do you want this flock of birds not to return?'

'I want, lord,[1] this flock of birds not to return.'

I said: 'Then you, monk, going there, and penetrating this thicket three times in the first watch of the night must utter this sound: 'Listen to me, good sirs, whatever birds have come to roost in this thicket, I want a feather. Good sirs, give me one feather at a time.' Three times in the middle watch . . . three times in the last watch . . . 'at a time.' Then, monks, this monk having gone there, and having penetrated the thicket, uttered this sound three times . . . in the middle watch of the night . . . in the last watch of the night . . . 'at a time.' Then, monks, that flock of birds said: 'The monk begs for a feather, the monk wants a feather,' and they departed from that thicket, and after they were gone, they did not come back again. Begging, monks, from these animals and living creatures will become hateful, hinting (will become) hateful, how much more then from men? || 4 ||

Once upon a time, monks, the father of Raṭṭhapāla, the noble youth, addressed these verses to Raṭṭhapāla, the noble youth:

'Tho' I do not know them, Raṭṭhapāla, the many-folk,
These, meeting me, beg—why do you not beg of me?'
'The beggar is not liked, the not-giver to beggar is not liked,[3]
Therefore I do not beg of you, do not be angry with me.'[4]

---

[1] *Bhante.* [2] *Bhagavā.* [3] For not giving is not liked, *VA.* 566.
[4] =*Jā.* iii. 352, 353, except first line.

Monks, if Raṭṭhapāla, the noble youth, can speak thus to his own father, how much more then can (any) person to (any other) person? || 5 ||

Monks, it is difficult for householders to collect possessions [**148**], and difficult to protect their stores; how can you, foolish men, dwell intent on begging, intent on asking by hinting (for something) from among these possessions which are difficult to collect, and from among these stores which are difficult to protect, saying: 'Give a man, give a servant, give an ox, give a wagon, give a knife, give a hatchet, give an axe, give a spade, give a chisel, give a creeper, give bamboo, give *muñja*-grass, give coarse grass, give *tiṇa*-grass, give clay.' This is not, foolish men, for the benefit of unbelievers . . . and, monks, thus this course of training should be set forth:

A monk begging in company[1] for having a hut built, which has no benefactor, for his own advantage, should make it according to measure. This is the measure: in length, twelve spans of a span of the accepted length[2]; in width seven spans inside. Monks should be brought for marking out the site. A site not involving destruction,[3] and with an open space round it,[4] should be marked out by these monks. If that monk should build a hut, begging himself for a site which involves destruction and which has not an open space round it, or if he should not bring the monks for marking out a site, or if he should exceed the measure, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order." || 6 || **1** ||

---

[1] *VA.* 566, "*saññācikā* means, having themselves inaugurated is called 'begging,' therefore *saññācikāya* is called begging themselves," *cf. VA.* 561 and below, *Old Comy.*, *sayaṃ yācitvā.*

[2] *Sugata-vidatthiyā*, see *Vin. Texts* i. 8, n. 2, for a discussion of this phrase. *VA.* 567, "a man of medium height is three spans, a builder's cubit (*hattha*, the hand used as a measure) is one and a half cubits."

[3] *Anārambha*—*i.e.*, to living creatures, see below, *Old Comy.*, p. 257.

[4] *Saparikkamana*—*i.e.*, accessible, good for rambling in. See below, *Old Comy.*, "possible for a cart drawn by a yoke of oxen to go round it." I follow trans. as at *Vin. Texts* i. 8.

Begging in company means: oneself begging for a man, for a servant, for an ox, for a wagon, for a knife, for a hatchet, for an axe, for a spade, for a chisel . . . for *tiṇa*-grass, for clay.

A hut means: it is smeared inside or it is smeared outside, or it is smeared inside and outside.[1]

For having . . . built means: building or causing to be built.

Without a benefactor means: there is not anyone who is the owner, either a woman or a man or a householder or one who has gone forth.

For his own advantage means: for the good of himself.[2]

Should make it according to measure. This is the measure : in length, twelve spans of a span of the accepted length means: for the outside measure. *In width, seven inside* means: for the inside measure. || 1 ||

Monks should be brought for marking out a site means: that a monk building a hut, having cleared a site for a hut, approaching the Order, arranging his robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, squatting down on his heels, and saluting with his palms outstretched, should speak thus to them[3]: 'Honoured sirs, I, begging in company, for my own advantage, am desirous of building a hut, it has no benefactor; honoured sirs, I beg the Order for inspection of the site for a hut.' A second time it should be begged for, a third time [**149**] it should be begged for. If the whole Order[4] is able to inspect a site for a hut, it should be inspected by the whole Order. But if the whole Order is not able to inspect a site for a hut, then those monks who are experienced and competent to know what involves destruction, what does not involve destruction, what has an open space round it, what does not have

[1] =below, p. 267, in definition of *vihāra*.

[2] *Cf.* below, p. 268.

[3] *VA*. 569, "the Order should be spoken to thus by him."

[4] *I.e.*, all the community of a district or of a vihāra.

an open space round it—begging these, they should depute (them).

And thus, monks, should they depute (them): the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. Such and such a monk, begging in company, for his own advantage, desirous of building a hut which has no benefactor, begs the Order for inspection of the site for a hut. If it is the right time for the Order,[1] the Order should depute such and such monks to inspect a site for a hut for that monk. This is the motion. Let the Order listen to me, honoured sirs. Such and such a monk . . . site for a hut. The Order deputes such and such monks to inspect a site for a hut for such and such a monk. If it seems good to the venerable ones to depute the inspection of a site for a hut to such and such monks for that monk, be silent; if it does not seem good, then you should speak. Such and such monks are deputed by the Order to inspect a site for a hut for such and such a monk. It seems good to the Order, therefore they are silent; thus do I understand.'

These monks (thus) deputed, going there, a site for a hut, should be inspected, it should be known whether it involves destruction, whether it does not involve destruction, whether it has an open space round it, whether it does not have an open space round it. If it involves destruction and has not an open space round it, it should be said: Do not build here. If it does not involve destruction and has an open space round it, the Order should be told that it does not involve destruction and that it has an open space round it. The monk building the hut, going up to the Order, arranging his robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, squatting down on his heels, and saluting with his palms outstretched, should speak thus: 'I, honoured sirs, begging in company, am desirous of building a hut; it has no benefactor, it is for my own advantage.

[1] *VA.* 569, "for this inspection."

Honoured sirs, I beg the Order to mark out the site for a hut.' A second time it should be begged for, a third time it should be begged for. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. Such and such a monk, begging in company, is desirous of building a hut, it has no benefactor, it is for his own advantage. He begs the Order to mark out a site for a hut. If it is the right time for the Order, the Order should mark out a site for a hut for such and such a monk. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. Such and such a monk . . . site for a hut. [**150**] The Order marks out a site for a hut for such and such a monk. If the marking out of the site for a hut for such and such a monk seems good to the venerable ones, be silent; if it does not seem good, then speak. The site for a hut for such and such a monk is marked out by the Order. It seems good to the Order, therefore they are silent; thus do I understand.' ||2||

Involving destruction means: if it is the abode of ants or if it is the abode of termites or if it is the abode of rats or if it is the abode of snakes or if it is the abode of scorpions or if it is the abode of centipedes or if it is the abode of elephants or if it is the abode of horses or if it is the abode of lions or if it is the abode of tigers or if it is the abode of leopards or if it is the abode of bears or if it is the abode of hyenas[1] or if it is the abode of any other animals or living creatures, or if it is connected with[2] grain or if it is connected with vegetables, or if it is connected with the slaughtering-place[3] or if it is connected with the execution-block or if it is connected with a cemetery or if it is connected with a pleasure-grove or if it is connected with the king's property or if it is connected with elephant-stables or if it is connected

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 98; *A.* iii. 101; *Jā.* v. 416. At *Vin.* i. 219-220 it is a dukkaṭa to eat the flesh of some of these animals.

[2] *Nissita* throughout.

[3] For thieves, *VA.* 570.

with horses' stables or if it is connected with a prison or if it is connected with a tavern[1] or if it is connected with a slaughter-house or if it is connected with a carriage road or if it is connected with a cross-road or if it is connected with a public rest-house or if it is connected with a meeting-place:[2] this means *involving destruction.*

Not with an open space round it means: It is not possible to go round it even with a yoked wagon, to go round it everywhere with a ladder.[3] This means *not with an open space round it.*

Not involving destruction means: if it is not the abode of ants nor is it the abode of termites . . . it is not connected with a meeting-place. This means *not involving destruction.*

With an open space round it means: it is possible to go round it even with a yoked wagon, to go round it everywhere with a ladder. This means *with an open space round it.* || 3 ||

Begging in company means: oneself begging saying: Give a man . . . give clay.

A hut means: it is smeared inside or it is smeared outside or it is smeared inside and outside.

Should build means: he builds or he causes to be built.

If he should not bring the monks for marking out a site, or if he should exceed the measure means: not having caused the site for a hut to be marked out by a vote following upon the motion, he builds or causes to be built, exceeding the length or width by as much as even a hair's breadth, in each operation there is an offence of wrong-doing. If one lump[4] is (still) to come there is a grave offence, but when that lump has come

[1] At *Vin.* iv. 267 nuns are forbidden to keep both such places.

[2] Text reads, *saṃsaraṇa; VA.* 570 reads *sañcaraṇa.*

[3] *VA.* 570, "a ladder having been put up by those approving of the hut, it is not possible to go round it with a ladder (to lean a ladder on every point of it).

[4] Of plaster, *VA.* 571.

there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.[1]

Offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order means: . . . because of this it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. || 4 || **2** || **[151]**

If a monk builds a hut, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with two offences of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site not having been marked out, not involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site not having been marked out, not involving destruction, having an open space round it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If a monk builds a hut, the site having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site having been marked out, involving destruction, having an open space round it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site having been marked out, not involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site having been marked out, not involving destruction, having an open space round it, there is no offence. || 1 ||

[1] *Cf.* below, p. 268.

If a monk builds a hut, exceeding the measure, involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with two offences of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, exceeding the measure, involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, exceeding the measure, not involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, exceeding the measure, not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If a monk builds a hut to (the right) measure, involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut to (the right) measure, involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut to (the right) measure, not involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut to (the right) measure, not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is no offence. || 2 ||

If a monk builds a hut, the site not having been marked out, exceeding the measure, involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there are two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with two offences of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site not having been marked out, exceeding the measure, involving destruction, with an open space round it, there are two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site not having been

marked out, exceeding the measure, not involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there are two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site not having been marked out, exceeding the measure, not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there are two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order. || 3 || [152]

If a monk builds a hut, the site having been marked out, to (the right) measure, involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site having been marked out, to (the right) measure, involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site having been marked out, to (the right) measure, not involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site having been marked out, to (the right) measure, not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is no offence. || 4 ||

A monk commands: "Build a hut for me." If they build a hut for him, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with two offences of wrong-doing . . . If they build a hut for him, the site having been marked out, to (the right) measure, not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is no offence. || 5 ||

A monk having commanded: "Build a hut for me," went away. But he did not command: "Let the site be marked out, and let it not involve destruction, and let it have an open space round it." They built a hut for him, the site not having been marked out, involving

destruction, not with an open space round it: there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with two offences of wrong-doing . . . the site having been marked out, not involving destruction, with an open space round it: there is no offence. || 6 ||

A monk having commanded: "Build a hut for me," went away. But he did not command: "Let it be to (the right) measure, and not involving destruction, and with an open space round it." They built a hut for him, exceeding the measure, involving destruction, not with an open space round it: there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with two offences of wrong-doing . . . to (the right) measure, not involving destruction, with an open space round it: there is no offence. || 7 ||

A monk having commanded: "Build a hut for me," went away. But he did not command: "Let the site be marked out, and let it be to (the right) measure, and not involving destruction, and with an open space round it." They built a hut for him, the site not having been marked out, exceeding the measure, involving destruction, not with an open space round it: there are two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with two offences of wrong-doing . . . the site having been marked out, to (the right) measure, not involving destruction, with an open space round it: there is no offence. || 8 ||

A monk having commanded: "Build a hut for me," went away. And he commanded: "Let the site be marked out, and let it not involve destruction, and let it have an open space round it." They built a hut for him, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it. He heard and said: "They say that a hut was built for me, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it." This monk should go himself or a messenger should be sent, saying:

"Let the site be marked out, [153] and let it not involve destruction, and let it have an open space round it." If he should not go himself or send a messenger, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

A monk having commanded: "Build a hut for me," . . . they built a hut for him, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, with an open space round it. He heard . . . or a messenger should be sent saying: "Let the site be marked out, and let it not involve destruction." If he should not go himself nor send a messenger, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

A monk having commanded: . . . "Let the site be marked out, and with an open space round it . . . Let the site be marked out . . . Let it not involve destruction, and let there be an open space round it . . . Let it not involve destruction . . . Let there be an open space round it" . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing. . . . They built a hut for him, the site not having been marked out, not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is no offence. || 9 ||

A monk having commanded: "Build a hut for me," went away. And he commanded: "Let it be to (the right) measure, and not involving destruction, and with an open space round it." They built a hut for him, exceeding the measure, involving destruction, not with an open space round it. He heard and said: "They say that a hut was built for me, exceeding the measure, involving destruction, not with an open space round it." This monk should go himself or a messenger should be sent, saying: "Let it be to (the right) measure, and not involving destruction, and with an open space round it . . . Let it be to (the right) measure, and not involving destruction . . . Let it be to (the right) measure, and with an open space round it . . . Let it be to (the right) measure . . . Let it not involve destruction, and let it have an open space round it . . . Let it not involve destruction . . . Let it have an open space round it" . . . there is no offence. || 10 ||

A monk having commanded: "Build a hut for me," went away. He commanded: "Let the site be marked out, and let it be to (the right) measure, and let it not involve destruction, and let it have an open space round it." They built a hut for him, the site not having been marked out, exceeding the (right) measure involving destruction, not with an open space round it. He heard . . . no offence. || 11 ||

A monk having commanded: "Build a hut for me," went away. He commanded: "Let the site be marked out, and let it not involve destruction, and let there be an open space round it." They built the hut for him, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it: there are three offences of wrong-doing for the builders . . . involving destruction, with an open space round it: there are two offences of wrong-doing for the builders . . . not involving destruction, not with an open space round it: there are two offences of wrong-doing for the builders . . . not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is an offence of wrong-doing for the builders . . . the site having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it: there are two offences of wrong-doing for the builders . . . involving destruction, with an open space round it: there is an offence of wrong-doing for the builders . . . [**154**] not involving destruction, not with an open space round it: there is an offence of wrong-doing for the builders . . . not involving destruction, with an open space round it: there is no offence. || 12 ||

A monk having commanded: "Build a hut for me," went away. He commanded: "Let it be to (the right) measure, and not involving destruction, and with an open space round it" . . . A monk having commanded: "Build a hut for me," went away. He commanded: "Let the site be marked out, and let it be to (the right) measure, and not involving destruction, and with an open space round it" . . . there is no offence. || 13 ||

A monk having commanded: "Build a hut for me," went away. They built a hut for him, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it. If he comes back (and finds that it is) imperfectly executed, the hut should be given by this monk to another, or being destroyed should be rebuilt. If he does not give it to another, or destroying it have it rebuilt, there are two offences of wrong-doing together with an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. . . . A monk having commanded: "Build a hut for me," went away. They built a hut for him, the site having been marked out, to (the right) measure, not involving destruction, with an open space round it: there is no offence. || 14 ||

If he finishes[1] by himself what was imperfectly executed by himself, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. If others finish what was imperfectly executed by himself, there is an offence . . . of the Order. If he finishes by himself what was imperfectly executed by others, there is an offence . . . of the Order. If others finish what was imperfectly executed by others, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. || 15 ||

There is no offence if it is (built) in a mountain-cave[2] as a hut,[3] as a hut of *tiṇa*-grass,[4] for the good

---

[1] *Cf. Vin.* iii. 225, 229.

[2] *leṇa. Vin.* i. 206=iii. 248, trans. at *Vin. Texts* ii. 61, "cave dwelling-place." At *Vin.* ii. 146 it is given as the generic term for five kinds of abode.

[3] *guhā, VA.* 573, "a hut of bricks or in a rock or of wood or of earth." *Guhā* is mentioned at *Vin.* i. 58=96, with the four other abodes of *Vin.* ii. 146, as an allowance extra to that of dwelling at the foot of a tree. At *Vin.* i. 107 the Order is allowed to fix upon an Uposatha Hall in any one of these five dwelling-places, and at *Vin.* i. 239 the Order is allowed to keep the stores in any one of them. *Cf. Vin.* i. 284.

[4] "= a seven-storied palace if (only) the covering is of leaves or of tiṇa-grass," *VA.* 573. A seven-storied (*sattabhūmaka*) hut is, I suppose, conceivable, but seems hardly possible.

of another[1] except it be as a house, there is no offence in any of these circumstances,[2] nor if he is out of his mind or a beginner.[3] || 16 || 3 ||

Told is the Sixth Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order: that of building a hut[4]

---

[1] "If it is built for the benefit of a preceptor or teacher or for the Order," *VA*. 574.

[2] *VA*. 574, "except it be as a house (dwelling or home, *agāra*) for himself, he has it built, saying: 'It will become another hall for the recitation of the Pāṭimokkha, or a hot room for bathing purposes, or a dining-room, or a warmed refectory'; in all these circumstances there is no offence. But if he says that it will become these things and that 'I will dwell in it,' there is an offence."

[3] For these exemptions *cf. Vin.* iv. 48; *VA*. 574 indicates that the monks of Āḷavī were beginners.

[4] Probably *niṭṭhitaṃ* is omitted here by mistake.

FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHÂDISESA) VII

. . . at Kosambī in Ghosita's Park.[1] At that time a householder, the supporter[2] of the venerable Channa,[3] said to the venerable Channa:

"Do find out a site for a vihāra,[4] honoured sir. I will have a vihāra built for the master."

Then the venerable Channa, clearing a site for the vihāra, had a tree cut down that was used as a shrine,[5] revered by village, revered by little town, revered by town, revered by the country-side, revered by the kingdom. People became vexed, annoyed, angry, saying: "How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have a tree cut down that is used as a shrine [155] revered by village . . . revered by the kingdom? The recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are depriving a one-facultied thing[6] of life." The monks heard these people who were vexed, annoyed, angry. Those who were modest monks became vexed, annoyed, angry and said:

---

[1] *VA.* 574, "it was made, they say, by Ghosita, the great merchant."

[2] *VA.* 574, "at the time of the *bodhisatta* Channa was his supporter."

[3] *Cf. Vin.* ii. 21 ff.; at *Vin.* ii. 88, he took the side of the nuns in a quarrel with the monks; at *Vin.* ii. 290 the *brahmadaṇḍa* penalty was laid on him, but he attained arahanship (*D.* ii. 154). *Cf.* also *Vin.* iv. 35 f., 47, 113, 141 and below, p. 309.

[4] *VA.* 574, "not a whole vihāra, but one dwelling-place." Vihāra originally was probably rather more than "cell," and "cell" would most likely have been called *pariveṇa*, a monk's cell, *cf. Vin. Texts* iii. 109, and above, p. 119.

[5] *VA.* 575 explains *cetiya* by *cittikata.* This is from *citti-karoti*, to honour, to esteem. *VA.* 575 further says that "a *cetiya* is for the sake of honouring: the term is used of those worthy of worship, of sacred places. *Cetiya* means the honoured (or revered or selected) tree, it is a tree used (as a place) for honouring." See above, p. 243, n. 4, and p. 247, n. 2.

[6] With body-sensibility—*i.e.*, sense of touch.

"How can the venerable Channa have a tree cut down that was used as a shrine, revered by village . . . revered by the kingdom?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, Channa, that you had a tree cut down that was used as a shrine, revered by village . . . revered by the kingdom?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, have a tree cut down that was used as a shrine, revered by village . . . revered by the kingdom? For, foolish man, in a tree are people having consciousness as living beings. This is not, foolish man, for the benefit of unbelievers . . . Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

If there is a monk building a large[1] vihāra for his own advantage, having a benefactor, monks should be brought for marking out a site. A site should be marked out by these monks, not involving destruction, with an open space round it. If a monk should build a large vihāra on a site involving destruction, not with an open space round it, or if he should not bring monks to mark out a site, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order." ||1||

Large means: it is called a vihāra having a benefactor.[2]

Vihāra means: it is smeared inside or it is smeared outside or it is smeared inside and outside.[3]

---

[1] *Mahallaka*, here not in the usual sense of "full of years," but =*mahantabhāvo* . . . *pamāṇamahantāya mahallakaṃ* . . . *atthadassanatthaṃ mahallako nāma*, *VA*. 575. But see *Old Comy.'s* definition below. *Cf. Vin.* ii. 166, where a vihāra is also called *mahallaka*.

[2] Because then it can be made to the size of the approved measure, apparently meaning not smaller than this.

[3] *Cf.* above, p. 254, where hut, *kuṭī*, is defined in these same terms. *Ullittāvalitta*, which I have rendered "smeared inside and outside," also occurs at *A*. i. 101=*M*. iii. 61, in the simile of the (wise and foolish) non-inflammable and inflammable house with gabled roofs.

Building means: building or causing to be built.

Having a benefactor means: a certain person is the benefactor: a woman or a man or a householder or one who has gone forth.[1]

For his own advantage means: for his own good.[1]

Monks should be brought for marking out a site means: that monk building a vihāra, clearing the site for a vihāra . . . (*see* Formal Meeting VI. **2**, 2) . . . should say: 'I, honoured sirs, am desirous of building a large vihāra, having a benefactor, for my own advantage; honoured sirs, I beg the Order to inspect the site for a vihāra . . . this is called having an open space round it.

Large means: it is called a vihāra having a benefactor.

Vihāra means: it is smeared inside or it is smeared outside or it is smeared inside and outside.

Should build means: he builds or he causes to be built.

If he should not bring monks to mark out the site means: not having caused the site for a vihāra to be marked out by a vote following directly upon the motion, he builds or causes to be built, [**156**] in each operation there is an offence of wrong-doing. If one lump (of plaster) is (still) to come, there is a grave offence; when that lump has come there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.[2]

Offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order means: . . . on account of this it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. || **2** ||

If a monk builds a vihāra, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it . . . (*see* Formal Meeting VI. **3**, 1. *The sections which contain* "exceeding the measure" *and* "to (the right) measure" *are not repeated here*) . . . the site having been marked out, involving no destruction, with an open space round it, there is no offence. || 1 ||

---

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 254. [2] *Cf.* above, p. 258.

A monk commanded: "Build a vihāra for me." They built a vihāra for him, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it . . . the site not having been marked out, not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is no offence. || 2 ||

A monk having commanded: "Build a vihāra for me," went away. And he did not command: "Let there be marking out of the site, and let it not involve destruction, and let it have an open space round it." They built a vihāra for him, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it . . . the site having been marked out, not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is no offence. || 3 ||

A monk having commanded: "Build a vihāra for me," went away. And he commanded: "Let there be marking out of the site, and not involving destruction, and with an open space round it." They built the vihāra for him, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it. He heard and said: "They say that a vihāra was built for me, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it." If this monk should go himself . . . there is no offence. || 4 ||

A monk having commanded: "Build a vihāra for me," went away. And he commanded: "Let there be marking out of the site, and let it not involve destruction, and let there be an open space round it." They built a vihāra for him, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it. For the builders there are three offences of wrong-doing . . . the site marked out, not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is no offence. || 5 ||

A monk having commanded: "Build a vihāra for me," went away. They built a vihāra for him, the site

not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it. If he comes back there (and finds that it is) imperfectly executed . . . the site having been marked out, not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is no offence. || 6 ||

If he finishes by himself what was imperfectly executed by himself . . . (=Formal Meeting, VI. **3**, 15, 16) . . . if he is a beginner. || 7 || **3** ||

Told is the Seventh Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order: that of building a vihāra [**157**]

FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHÂDISESA) VIII

At one time[1] the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding place. At that time perfection had been attained by the venerable Dabba,[2] the Mallian,[3] seven years after his birth. All that there is to be attained by a disciple had been fully attained by him[4]; for him there was nothing further to be done,[5] no increase[6] to (be added to) that which had been done. Then the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, as he was meditating alone and in solitude, thought: " Perfection was realised by me seven years after my birth. Whatever there is to be attained by a disciple, all this has been fully attained by me; for me there is nothing further to be done, no increase (to be added) to that which has been done. What now if I should render a service to the

---

[1] From here to **1**, 9 below=*Vin.* ii. 74-79; trans. at *Vin. Texts* iii. 4-18.

[2] *VA.* 576, " he realised arahanship in the tonsure hall "—*i.e.*, as his curls were being cut off. *Cf. Thag.*, verse 5, and *Pss. Breth.*, p. 10; at *A.* i. 24 he is called " chief among those who assign quarters."

[3] The son of the rāja or chief of the Mallians.

[4] *VA.* 576, " the threefold wisdom, the four branches of logical analysis, the six super-knowings, the nine other-worldly matters."

[5] *VA.* 576, " It is said that by him there is nothing further to be done in the four true things, the four Ways, owing to the commission of the sixteenfold thing that ought to be done."

[6] *paticaya.* This is trans. at *Vin. Texts* iii. 4 as " nothing left that he ought to gather up as the fruit of his past labour." But this, I think, is reading more into these words than is justified. Bu. at *VA.* 576 says, " there is no increasing (*vaḍḍhana*) of what ought to be done," such as cleansing (a cleaned bowl). I think that this is the right interpretation. *Cf. Vin.* i. 183, 185; *A.* iii. 376; iv. 355 for phrase *katassa vā paṭicayaṃ*. *Pati°* as at *Vin.* iii. 158 above is unusual.

Order ?" Then the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, thought: " What now if I should assign lodgings to the Order, and should distribute the meals ?" || 1 ||

Then the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, rising up from his meditation at evening time, approached the lord, and having approached him and greeted him, he sat down to one side. As he was sitting to one side, the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, said to the lord: " Now, lord, as I was meditating alone and in solitude, I thought: ' . . . What now if I were to render a service to the Order ?' I thought of this, lord: ' What now if I were to assign lodgings to the Order ? What if I should distribute the meals ?' "

" It is good, it is good, Dabba; then, you, Dabba, assign the lodgings to the Order and distribute the meals."

" Very well, lord," the reverend Dabba, the Mallian, answered the lord. || 2 ||

Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given dhamma-talk, addressed the monks: " Monks, let the Order consent that Dabba, the Mallian, should assign the lodgings and should distribute the meals. Monks, this should be authorised thus: Dabba should first be asked and having been asked, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk: ' Honoured sirs, let the Order hear me. If it is the right time for the Order, let the Order consent that the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, should assign the lodgings and distribute the meals. [158] That is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order hear me. The Order agrees that the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, should assign the lodgings and distribute the meals. If it pleases the venerable ones and there is permission that the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, should assign lodgings and distribute the meals, then be silent; if it does not seem good, then you should speak. It is agreed by the Order that the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, should assign the lodgings and distribute the

meals. It is agreed . . . Thus do I understand.' "[1]
||3||

Then the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, being so chosen, assigned one lodging in the same place for those monks who belonged to the same company. For those monks who knew the Suttantas he assigned a lodging in the same place, saying: " These will be able to chant over[2] the Suttantas to one another." For those monks versed in the Vinaya rules, he assigned a lodging in the same place, saying: "They will decide upon the Vinaya with one another." For those monks teaching dhamma he assigned a lodging in the same place, saying: " They will discuss dhamma with one another." For those monks who were musers he assigned a lodging in the same place, saying: "They will not disturb one another." For those monks who lived indulging in low talk[3] and who were athletic he assigned a lodging in the same place, saying: "These reverend ones will live[4] according to their pleasure." For those monks who came in late at night[5] he, having attained the condition of heat,[6] assigned a lodging by this

---

[1] *Cf. Vin.* ii. 176, where it is said that " at that time there was no one who allotted lodgings for the Order," and *Vin.* ii. 175, where it is said that " at that time there was no one who distributed meals for the Order."

[2] N.B. *not* to read: writing was apparently very little used at this date.

[3] *tiracchānakathikā,* lit. talkers about animals, so: talkers on low or childish subjects.

[4] *acchissantī ti viharissanti, VA.* 579.

[5] *vikāle.*

[6] *tejodhātuṃ samāpajjitvā.* At *Ud.* 92 Dabba is credited with this same power, which he exerted at the time of his utter waning out. This power is also ascribed to Gotama at *Vin.* i. 25; and to Uppalavaṇṇā at *ThigA.* 190. See *Minor Anthologies of the Pali Canon,* ii. *S.B.B.* viii., p. 11, n. 1, where Mr. Woodward considers that this " power over the fire-element is probably the basis of *śakti* (suttee) in India." I think, however, that suttee is connected with *satī,* the good, virtuous wife; while *śakti* is lit. ability, will-power, influence. *Cf. S.* i. 144 and *K.S.* i. 182, n. 2; also *A.* i. 176; ii. 165; *D.* iii. 27 228, 247.

light.[1] So much so, that the monks came in late at night on purpose, (and) they thought: "We will see the wonder of the psychic potency of the venerable Dabba, the Mallian." And having approached the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, they spoke thus: "Reverend Dabba, assign a lodging to us."

The venerable Dabba, the Mallian, spoke thus to them: "Where do your reverences desire it? Where shall I assign it?"

Then these (monks) would quote a distant place on purpose, saying: "Reverend Dabba, assign us a lodging on the Vulture's Peak[2]; your reverence, assign us a lodging on the Robber's Cliff; your reverence, assign us a lodging on the slopes of Isigili Hill[3] on the Black Rock; your reverence, assign us a lodging on the slopes of Vebhāra[4] at Sattapaṇṇi Cave; your reverence, assign us a lodging in Sītā's Wood[5] on the slopes of the Snake Pool; your reverence, assign us a lodging at the Gomaṭa Glen; your reverence, assign us a lodging at the Tinduka Glen; your reverence, assign us a lodging at the Tapodā Glen[6]; your reverence, assign us a lodging at the Tapodā Park[6]; your reverence, assign us [159] a lodging at Jīvaka's Mango Grove;[7]

---

[1] *VA.* 579, "having entered upon the fourth jhāna by meditation on fire, arising from that his fingers were glowing as a result of knowledge in the six super-knowings": the power of *iddhi*, or psychic potency, was one of the six *abhiññā*.

[2] A mountain near Rājagaha. These place-names also occur at *D.* ii. 116.

[3] *Isigilipassa.* Here at the Black Rock, Godhika took his own life, *S.* i. 120, and Vakkali, *S.* iii. 123. From here the other peaks round Rājagaha could be seen, *M.* iii. 68.

[4] One of the mountains near Rājagaha. See *Pss. Breth.* p. 45, n., and illustrations facing p. 364.

[5] *Vin.* i. 182.

[6] The river Tapodā (hot waters) ran beneath the Vebhāra Hill. See above, p. 188, and n. 1. Samiddhi was tempted by a devatā as he was bathing in the Tapodā, *S.* i. 8 ff., which is very similar to the Samiddhi Jātaka, *Jā.* ii. 56.

[7] A garden at Rājagaha belonging to the physician Jīvaka Komārabhacca. Mentioned at *M.* i. 368 (*cf. MA.* iii. 45). The Sāmaññaphala Suttanta was spoken here, *D.* i. 47; this is referred to at *Vin.* ii. 287.

your reverence, assign us a lodging in the deer-park at Maddakucchi."[1]

The venerable Dabba, the Mallian, having attained the condition of heat for these (monks) went in front of each with his finger glowing; and they by the light of the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, went behind him. The venerable Dabba, the Mallian, assigned a lodging to them and said: "This is the couch, this the bed, this the bolster, this the pillow, this a privy, that a privy, this the drinking water, that the water for washing, this the staff, this is (the form of) the Order's agreement, this is the time it should be entered upon, this the time it should be departed from." Then the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, having assigned a lodging to these (men), went back again to the Bamboo Grove.[2] ||4||

Now at that time the monks who were the followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka[3] were newly ordained and of little merit; they obtained whatever inferior lodgings belonged to the Order and inferior meals. At that time the people in Rājagaha wished to give the Elder monks alms-food having a specially good seasoning,[4] and ghee and oil and dainties.[5] But to the monks who were the

[1] At *Vin.* i. 105 the Bhagavan appeared to Mahākappina here and exhorted him to observe the Uposatha. At both *S.* i. 27 and 110 it is said that in this garden Gotama's foot was hurt by a splinter.

[2] *VA.* 579, "talking to them with talk about the country, he did not sit down, but returned to his own dwelling."

[3] *VA.* 579, "the chief men of the sixfold group." At *VA.* 614 (on *Vin.* iii. 179) it is said that Assaji and Punabbasuka are the foremost in this group, and at *MA.* iii. 186, they are called "among these six, two teachers of the crowd."

[4] *abhisaṃkhārika piṇḍapāta. Abhi°* means what specially belongs to the *saṃkhāras*, merit-accumulating. *P.T.S. Dict.* suggests tentatively "specially prepared." The parallel passage at *Vin.* ii. 77 omits *piṇḍapāta.* The reading there is probably defective, and has led translators of *Vin. Texts* iii., p. 9, to render *abhi°* as a "wishing-gift." See *ibid.*, n. 3.

[5] *uttaribhaṅga*; also at *Vin.* iv. 259; *Jā.* i. 349. Ghee, oil and *uttari°* are mentioned together at *Vin.* ii. 214.

followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka they gave ordinary food, unseasoned porridge of broken rice[1] accompanied by sour gruel. These, after they had eaten and had returned from their meal, asked the Elder monks: "What did you get, your reverences, at the refectory? What did you?"

Some Elders spoke thus: "There was ghee for us, your reverences, there was oil for us, there were dainties for us."

But the monks who were the followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka spoke thus: "Your reverences, there was nothing for us, (only) ordinary food, unseasoned porridge of broken rice accompanied by sour gruel." || 5 ||

At that time a householder who had nice food gave to the Order in continuous food supply a meal for four monks. He, together with his wife and children, attended and served in the refectory. One offered boiled rice, another offered curry, another offered oil, another offered dainties. Now at that time a meal given by the householder who had nice food was apportioned for the following day to the monks who were the followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka. Then the householder who had nice food went to the park on some business and approached the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, and having approached the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, and greeted him, he sat down to one side. As he was sitting to one side, **[160]** the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, rejoiced . . . gladdened with dhamma-talk the householder who had nice food. Then when the householder who had nice food had been rejoiced . . . gladdened with dhamma-talk by the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, he said to the venerable Dabba, the Mallian: "For whom, honoured sir, is the meal apportioned for tomorrow in our house?"

"Householder, the food apportioned in your house for tomorrow is for the monks who are the followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka."

---

[1] *kaṇājakaṃ=sakuṇḍakabhattaṃ*, a meal with husk-powder cake. *Cf. Jā.* v. 383.

Then the householder who had nice food was sorry and said: "How can these depraved monks[1] enjoy themselves in our house?" And going to his house, he gave orders to a female slave, saying: "Having prepared for those who come to eat tomorrow a seat in the store-room,[2] serve them with porridge of broken rice accompanied by sour gruel."

"Very well, master," the female slave answered the householder who had nice food. || 6 ||

Then the monks who were the followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka said to one another: "Yesterday, your reverences, a meal was allotted to us by the householder who has nice food. Tomorrow the householder who has nice food, attending with his wife and children, will serve us. Some will offer boiled rice, some will offer curry, some will offer oil, some will offer dainties." These, because of their happiness, did not sleep that night as much as they had expected.

Then the monks who were the followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka, rising up early and setting out taking their bowls and robes, approached the dwelling of the householder who had nice food. The female slave saw the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka coming from afar; and seeing them and making ready a seat in the store-room, she said to the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka: "Sit here, honoured sirs."

Then the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka thought: "But undoubtedly the food will

[1] This acquiescence in "*pāpabhikkhū*" is curious. It reminds one of the lax monks, not uncommon in Burma at the present day, who do not keep the Vinaya precepts. There are said to be good and earnest monks who do keep them, but who are not seen about much for the very reason that they lead the good life, as intended.

[2] *koṭṭhaka,* a store-room for various things. At *Vin.* ii. 153 a *koṭṭhaka* is allowed to the monks. It was usually built over the gateway. Here *VA.* 580, says it was outside the gateway of the vihāra in the Bamboo Grove. See *Vin. Texts* iii. 109 for meanings and references.

not be ready,[1] since we are made to sit in the store-room."

Then the female slave came up with the porridge of broken rice accompanied by sour gruel and said: "Eat, honoured sirs."

"But, sister, we are those who enjoy a continuous supply of food."

"I know that the masters enjoy a continuous supply of food. But yesterday I was ordered by the householder: 'Having prepared a seat in the store-room for those who come for a meal today, serve them with porridge of broken rice accompanied by sour gruel.' Eat, honoured sirs," she said.

Then the monks who were the followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka said: "Yesterday, your reverences, the householder who has nice things to eat went to Dabba, the Mallian,[2] in the park; doubtless Dabba, the Mallian, set the householder at variance with us." These (monks) on account of their lamentations did not eat as much as was expected.

Then the monks who were the followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka, after **[161]** they had eaten and had returned from their meal, going to the park and putting aside their bowls, sat down outside the store-room of the park,[3] squatting against their outer cloaks,[4] silent, abashed, their shoulders bent,[5] their heads lowered, brooding, speechless.[6] || 7 ||

---

[1] *siddha.* This is p.p. of (1) *sijjati,* to boil, to cook; (2) *sijjhati,* to be accomplished, (see *P.E.D.*).

[2] Note that the monks now drop the epithet "venerable" or "reverend" in speaking of Dabba.

[3] *VA.* 580, "outside the door of the store-room of the vihāra of the Bamboo Grove."

[4] *saṅghāti-pallatthikāya,* a curious expression. *Palla°* also means "lolling," *cf. Vin.* iv. 129.

[5] *pattakkhandhā. Khandha* here, I think, in one of its crude meanings, of back or shoulder, and not as suggested at *Vin. Texts* iii. 13, n. 1, "faculties." See *K.S.* i. 155, n. 5. *VA.* 580=*MA.* ii. 104 explains *pattakkhandhā* as *patitakkhandhā.*

[6] All this is stock. *Cf. A.* iii. 57; *S.* i. 124=*M.* i. 258.

Then the nun Mettiyā[1] approached the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka, and having approached them she said to the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka: "I salute you, masters." When she had spoken thus the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka did not respond. A second time . . . A third time the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka did not respond.

"Do I offend against the masters? Why do the masters not respond to me?" she said.

"It is because you neglect us, sister, when we are got into difficulties by Dabba, the Mallian."

"What can I do, masters?" she said.

"If you would like, sister, this very day you could make the lord expel Dabba, the Mallian."

"What can I do, masters? How am I able to do that?" she said.

"Come, sister, go up to the lord, and having gone up, say to the lord: 'Now, lord, it is not suitable, it is not becoming that this quarter which should be without fear, secure, without danger is the very quarter which is full of fear, insecure, and full of danger. Where there was a calm, now there is a gale. It seems the very water is blazing. I have been assaulted by master[2] Dabba, the Mallian.'"

"Very well, masters," the nun Mettiyā answered the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka, and she approached the lord. Having approached and greeted the lord, she stood to one side. As she was standing to one side, the nun Mettiyā spoke thus to the lord: "Now, lord, it is not suitable . . . by master Dabba, the Mallian." || 8 ||

---

[1] The following narrative down to || 9 || = *Vin.* ii. 78-79 and is almost exactly the same as that recorded at *Vin.* ii. 124-127, except that here the monks send Vaḍḍha to the lord to say that Dabba has assaulted Vaḍḍha's wife.

[2] *ayyena*, instrumentive, therefore not "lord" (vocative) as at *Vin. Texts* iii. 14. *Ayya* was a usual way in which the laity and nuns addressed the monks, but I do not think that anyone ever addressed the lord thus.

Now the lord on this occasion and in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, asked the venerable Dabba, the Mallian:

" Dabba, do you remember doing as the nun Mettiyā says ?"

" Lord, the lord knows with regard to me," he said. A second time . . . a third time the lord said to the venerable Dabba, the Mallian . . . " with regard to me."

" Dabba, the Dabbas[1] do not give evasive answers like that. If what was done was done by you, say so; if it was not done by you, say it was not."

" Lord, since I was born, I cannot call to mind[2] ever indulging in sexual intercourse even in a dream; much less so when I was awake."

Then the lord addressed the monks, saying: " Because of this, expel the nun Mettiyā,[3] [162] and take these monks to task."

Having spoken thus, the lord rising up from his seat entered the vihāra. Then these monks expelled the nun Mettiyā. Then the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka said to those monks:

" Your reverences, do not expel the nun Mettiyā; she has not committed any sin; she was urged on by us, because we were angry, displeased and wanted him out of the way."

" But are not your reverences defaming the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, with an unfounded charge involving defeat ?"

" It is so, your reverences," they said.

Then those who were modest monks became annoyed, vexed and angry, and said: " How can the monks who

---

[1] They are wise, *VA.* 581. [2] *abhijānāmi.*

[3] This is, I think, clear evidence of monkish gloss. In every case of supposed wrong-doing the lord has always asked the supposed wrongdoer " Is it true ?" and has never condemned anyone without first hearing what he has to say. It is so noteworthy as to be suspicious: where a woman is involved she is given no chance to exculpate herself to the lord. See Horner, *Women under Primitive Buddhism*, p. 266.

are followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka defame the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, with an unfounded charge involving defeat ?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that you defamed Dabba, the Mallian, with an unfounded charge involving defeat ?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

Then the enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "How can you, foolish men, defame Dabba, the Mallian, with an unfounded charge involving defeat ? It is not, foolish men, for the benefit of unbelievers. . . . Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, malignant, malicious and ill-tempered, should defame a monk with an unfounded charge involving defeat, thinking: 'Thus perhaps may I drive him away from this Brahma-life,' then, if afterwards he, being pressed or not being pressed, the legal question turning out to be unfounded, if the monk confesses[1] his malice, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order." ||9||**1**||

Whatever means: who . . .

Monk means: . . . in this meaning *monk* is to be understood.

Monk[2] means: another monk.

Malignant, malicious means: angry, displeased, dissatisfied, the mind worsened, stubborn.[3]

Ill-tempered means: with this anger, with this hatred, and with this displeasure, and with this dissatisfaction he is angry.

---

[1] *patiṭṭhāti* with more general meaning of "to stand fast." But here, judging by the *Old Comy.*, see below at end of || **2** ||, it must mean "confess" with the sense that his words were standing on or founded in malice. The verb, however, in such meanings is followed by the loc. But *paṭi* governs the acc.

[2] acc.

[3] *Cf. Vin.* iv. 236, 238; *D.* iii. 238, *M.* i. 101

Unfounded means: unseen,[1] unheard, unsuspected.

Involving defeat means: of one of the four (headings involving defeat).

Should defame means: should reprove or should cause to reprove.[2]

Thus perhaps may I drive him away from this Brahma-life means: [**163**] I may drive (him) away from monkdom, I may drive (him) away from recluse-dhamma,[3] I may drive (him) away from the aggregates of morality, I may drive (him) away from the advantage of religious austerity.[4]

Afterwards means: in the moment in which he is defamed that moment, that minute, that second has passed.

Being pressed means: he is defamed in that matter in which he is pressed.

Not being pressed means: not being spoken to by anyone.

A legal question[5] means: there are four legal questions: legal questions arising out of disputes, legal questions arising out of censure, legal questions arising out of transgressions, legal questions arising out of obligations.

If the monk confesses his malice means: empty words have been spoken by me, a lie has been spoken by me, untruth has been spoken by me, it has been spoken by me not knowing.

Offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order means . . . on account of this it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. ||**2**||

---

[1] *VA*. 585, not seen by self or others, nor by the bodily eye, nor by clairvoyance.

[2] *VA*. 587, "should reprove means he reproves him himself with the words 'you have fallen into defeat' . . . should cause to reprove means . . . he enjoins another monk and this one reproves him with his (*i.e.*, the enjoiner's) words."

[3] *samaṇa-dhamma*, explained at *A*. iii. 371: therefore not "the ascetic's path" as at *Jā*. i. 31.

[4] *tapoguṇa*.

[5] *adhikaraṇa*. =*Vin*. iv. 126=238. *Cf*. *Vin*. ii. 88 ff., where the nature of these questions is explained, and ii. 99 ff., which explains the ways of settling these questions. At *M*. ii. 247 ff. Gotama is represented as explaining all this to Ānanda.

He is unseen by him committing[1] an offence involving defeat,[2] but if he reprimands him saying: "Seen by me, you are one who has committed[3] a matter involving defeat, you are not a (true) recluse, you are not a (true) son of the Sakyans, there is no (holding) the observance-day (ceremony),[4] or the ceremony held at the end of the rains,[5] or the ceremony performed by a chapter of monks[6] with you,"—for each speech[7] there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.[8]

He is unheard by him committing an offence involving defeat, but if he reprimands him saying: "Heard by me, you are . . ."—for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

He is unsuspected by him of committing an offence involving defeat, but if he reprimands him saying: "Suspected by me, you are . . ."—for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. || 1 ||

He is unseen by him committing an offence involving defeat, but if he reprimands him saying: "Seen and heard by me, you are one who has committed an offence involving defeat . . ."—for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

He is unseen by him committing an offence involving defeat, but if he reprimands him saying: "Seen and suspected by me . . . Seen, heard and suspected by me . . ."—for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

He is unheard by him committing an offence involving defeat, but if he reprimands him saying: "Heard and

---

[1] *ajjhāpajjanta*, pres. part. [2] *Pārājika dhamma.*

[3] *Ajjhāpanna*, past part.

[4] *Uposatha*, a chapter of monks meeting on the fifteenth day of each half-month to expound dhamma, *Vin.* i. 102. E. M. Hare, *G.S.* iv. 140, 170, gives "observance-day" for *uposatha*.

[5] *Pavāraṇā*, when the monks invite one another to tell of anything seen, heard or suspected to be wrong, *Vin.* i. 160 and *cf. Vin.* ii. 32.

[6] *Saṅghakamma*, the monks being assembled together in solemn conclave. *Cf. Vin.* i. 123, 143.

[7] *Vācāya vācāya.* [8] *Cf.* below, p. 292.

suspected by me . . . Heard and seen by me . . . Heard, seen and suspected by me . . ."—for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

He is unsuspected by him of committing an offence involving defeat, but if he reprimands him saying: " Suspected and seen by me . . . Suspected and heard by me . . . Suspected, seen and heard by me . . ."—for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. || 2 || [**164**]

He is seen by him committing an offence involving defeat, but if he reprimands him saying: " Heard by me . . . Suspected by me . . . Heard and suspected by me, you are one who has committed an offence involving defeat . . ."—for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

He is heard by him committing an offence involving defeat, but if he reprimands him saying: "Suspected by me . . . Seen by me . . . Suspected and seen by me . . ."—for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

He is suspected by him of committing an offence involving defeat, but if he reprimands him saying: " Seen by me . . . Heard by me . . . Seen and heard by me . . ."—for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. || 3 ||

He is seen by him committing an offence involving defeat; but he is in doubt as to the sight, he does not trust the sight, does not remember the sight, is confused as to the sight. He is in doubt as to what he has heard . . . is confused as to what he heard. He is in doubt as to the suspicion . . . he is confused as to what he suspected; yet he reprimands him saying: " Suspected and seen by me . . . Suspected and heard by me . . . Suspected and seen and heard by me . . ." —for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. || 4 ||

He is unseen by him committing an offence involving defeat, but if he causes him to be reprimanded saying: "You are seen, you are one who has committed an offence involving defeat . . ."—for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

He is unheard . . . He is unsuspected . . . || 5 ||

He is unseen by him committing an offence involving defeat, but if he causes him to be reprimanded saying: "You are seen and heard . . . You are seen and suspected . . . You are seen and heard and suspected . . ."—for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. ||6||

He is seen by him committing an offence involving defeat, but if he causes him to be reprimanded saying: "You are heard . . . You are suspected . . . You are heard and suspected . . ."

He is heard by him . . . He is suspected by him . . . || 7 ||

He is seen by him committing an offence involving defeat; he is in doubt as to the sight . . . he is confused as to what he suspected, yet he causes him to be reprimanded saying: "You are suspected and seen . . ." . . . he is confused as to what he suspected, yet he causes him to be reprimanded saying: "You are suspected and heard . . ." . . . he is confused as to what he suspected, yet he causes him to be reprimanded saying: "You are suspected and seen and heard . . . involving defeat . . ."—for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. || 8 || **3** || **[165]**

There is a view of what is pure in what is impure, a view of what is impure in what is pure, there is a view of what is impure in what is impure, a view of what is pure in what is pure. || 1 ||

If a man is impure, committing a certain offence involving defeat, even though there exist a view of purity, if he speaks desiring his expulsion, but without having gained his leave,[1] there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence requiring a formal meeting of the Order.

If a man is impure . . . if he speaks desiring his expulsion, but having gained his leave, it is an offence requiring a formal meeting of the Order.

If a man is impure . . . not having gained his leave, he spoke intending abuse, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with one of insulting speech.

If a man is impure . . . having gained his leave, he spoke intending abuse, it is an offence of insulting speech. ||2||

If a man is pure, not committing a certain offence involving defeat, even though there exist a view of impurity, if he speaks desiring his expulsion, but without having gained his leave, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If a man is pure . . . having gained his leave, he speaks intending his expulsion, there is no offence.

If it is a pure man . . . without having gained his leave, he speaks intending abuse, it is an offence of wrong-doing with one of insulting speech.

If it is a pure man . . . having gained his leave, he speaks intending abuse, it is an offence of insulting speech. ||3||

If a man is impure, committing a certain offence involving defeat, even though there exist a view as to impurity, he speaks wishing his expulsion, but not having gained his leave, there is an offence of wrong-doing . . . it is not an offence . . . it is an offence of wrong-doing with one of insulting speech . . . it is an offence of insulting speech. ||4||

[1] See *Vin.* i. 114, where it is said that no monk who has not given leave may be reproved for an offence.

If a man is pure, not committing an offence leading to defeat, even though there exist a view as to purity . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing with an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order . . . it is an offence requiring a formal meeting of the Order . . . it is an offence of wrong-doing with one of insulting speech . . . it is an offence of insulting speech. || 5 ||

There is no offence if there is a view as to what is impure in what is pure, if there is a view as to what is impure in what is impure, if he is mad, if he is a beginner. || 6 || **4** ||

Told is the Eighth Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order: that concerned with what is unfounded

FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHÂDISESA) IX

. . . at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. At that time as the monks who were the followers of Mettiya and Bhummaja were descending from the slope of the Vulture's Peak, they saw a he-goat copulating with a nanny-goat; [166] seeing them they said: " Look here, your reverences, let us call this he-goat Dabba, the Mallian, and this nanny-goat Mettiyā, the nun; thus we will express it: ' Formerly, your reverences, we spoke to Dabba, the Mallian, about what was heard, but now we have ourselves seen him sinning with the nun Mettiyā." These gave that he-goat the name of Dabba, the Mallian, and called that nanny-goat Mettiyā, the nun.

These told the monks: " Formerly, your reverences, we spoke to Dabba, the Mallian, about what was heard, but now we ourselves have seen him sinning with Mettiyā, the nun."

The monks said: " Your reverences, do not speak like that; the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, would not do that."

Then these monks told this matter to the lord. The lord, on that occasion, in that connection, having had the Order of monks convened, asked the venerable Dabba, the Mallian:

" Do you remember,[1] Dabba, to have done as these monks say ?"

" Lord, the lord knows with regard to me," he said.

A second time, the lord . . . a third time the lord said to the venerable Dabba, the Mallian . . . " knows with regard to me," he said.

---

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 280.

" Do not, Dabba, . . ." . . . " . . . how much more when I was awake," he said.

Then the lord addressed the monks: " Because of this, monks, you should put questions to these monks." Having spoken thus, the lord rising up from his seat, entered the vihāra. || 1 ||

Then these monks put questions[1] to the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka. These, being questioned by the monks, told this matter to the monks.

" Did you not defame the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, your reverences, with a charge of falling into defeat, taking up some point as a pretext in a legal question really belonging to something else ?"

" It is so, your reverences," they said.

Then those who were modest monks became annoyed, vexed and angry, and said: " How can the monks who are followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka defame the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, with . . . to something else ?"

Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said: " Is it true as is said, that you, monks, defamed Dabba, the Mallian, with . . . to something else ?"

" It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: " How can you, foolish men, defame Dabba, the Mallian, with . . . to something else ? Foolish men, it is not for the benefit of unbelievers . . . And thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, malignant, malicious and ill-tempered, **[167]** should defame a monk with a charge involving defeat, taking up some point as a pretext in a legal question really belonging to something else, saying: 'Thus perhaps may I drive him away from

[1] *VA.* 598, " Where did you see Dabbā with Mettiyā ? . . . at what time ? . . . where were you going then ? . . . Who knows you were at that time in the Bamboo Grove ? . . ."

this Brahma-life'; then, if afterwards, he, being pressed or not being pressed, the legal question turning out to belong to something different, if the monk confesses his malice and (confesses) having taken up some point as a pretext: it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order." ||2||1||

Whatever means: . . . (=Formal Meeting VIII. 2) . . . is angry. ||1||

In a legal question really belonging to something else means: either it is an offence of a different kind or it is a legal question of a different kind.

How is a legal question connected with a different kind of legal question? The legal question arising out of disputes may belong to something different: to a legal question arising out of censure, to a legal question arising out of transgressions, to a legal question arising out of obligations. A legal question arising out of censure . . . a legal question arising out of transgressions . . . a legal question arising out of obligations may belong to something different: to a legal question arising out of disputes, to a legal question arising out of transgressions, to a legal question arising out of obligations. Thus a legal question may belong to a different legal question.

How is a legal question connected with a legal question? A question arising out of disputes is connected with a question arising out of disputes. A question arising out of censure is connected with a question arising out of censure. A question arising out of transgression may be connected with a question arising out of transgression, or it may be connected with something else. How is a question arising out of transgression connected with something other than a question arising out of transgression? An offence involving defeat through sexual intercourse may belong to something else: to an offence involving defeat through taking something that was not given, to an offence involving

defeat through taking up human form, to an offence involving defeat through claiming states of further-men. An offence involving defeat through taking something that was not given . . . an offence involving defeat through taking up human form . . . an offence involving defeat through claiming states of further-men may belong to something else: to an offence involving defeat through sexual intercourse, to an offence involving defeat through taking something that was not given, to an offence involving defeat through taking up human form. Thus a question arising out of transgression may belong to something other than a question arising out of transgression. And how can a question arising out of transgression belong to a question arising out of transgression? An offence involving defeat through sexual intercourse may belong to an offence involving defeat through sexual intercourse . . . an offence involving defeat through claiming states of further-men may belong to an offence involving defeat through claiming states of further-men. Thus does a question arising out of transgression belong to a question arising out of transgression. A question arising out of obligations may belong to a question arising out of obligations. Thus may a legal question belong to a legal question. || 2 ||

Taking up some point as a pretext.[1] A pretext means that there are ten pretexts: [**168**] the pretext of birth, the pretext of name, the pretext of family, the pretext of characteristic, the pretext of offence, the pretext of a bowl, the pretext of a robe, the pretext of a teacher, the pretext of a preceptor, the precept of lodgings.

The pretext of birth means: A noble is seen committing[2] a matter involving defeat; seeing another noble[3] he reprimands him, saying: "A noble is seen by me; you are one who has committed[4] a matter involving defeat,

---

[1] *Lesa.* [2] *Ajjhāpajjanta.*

[3] *VA.* 601, who was a monk, he seizes the pretext of his khattiya birth.

[4] *Ajjhāpanna.*

you are not a (true) recluse, you are not a (true) son of the Sakyans; there is no (holding) the observance-day (ceremony) with you, or the ceremony at the termination of the rains, or the ceremony performed by a chapter of monks "—for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.[1]

A brahmin is seen . . . a merchant is seen . . . a low-caste man is seen . . . for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

The pretext of name means: one who is a Buddharakkhita is seen . . . one who is a Dhammarakkhita is seen . . . one who is a Saṅgharakkhita is seen committing a matter involving defeat; seeing another Saṅgharakkhita . . . for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

The pretext of family means: a Gotama is seen . . . a Moggallāna is seen . . . a Kaccāna is seen . . . a Vāsiṭṭha is seen committing an offence involving defeat; seeing another Vāsiṭṭha . . . for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

The pretext of characteristic means: a tall man is seen . . . a short man is seen . . . a dark man is seen . . . a fair man is seen committing an offence involving defeat . . . for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

The pretext of an offence means: one is seen committing a slight offence, and if he reprimands him for a matter involving defeat, saying: "You are not a (true) recluse . . ." . . . for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

The pretext of a bowl means: one carrying a copper bowl is seen . . . one carrying a bowl of hide[2] is seen . . . one carrying a cracked bowl[3] is seen committing a matter involving defeat . . . for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

---

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 283.

[2] *VA.* 602, *sāṭakapatta,* "like the copper bowl it is well-turned, of beautiful hide, glossy, of black colour (lit. bee-coloured), it is called a clay bowl."

[3] *VA.* 602, "it was an ordinary clay bowl."

The pretext of a robe means: one wearing robes taken from the dust-heap is seen . . . one wearing householders' robes is seen committing a matter involving defeat . . . for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

The pretext of a teacher means: the pupil of such and such a one is seen committing a matter involving defeat . . . for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

The pretext of a preceptor means: the novice of such and such a one is seen committing a matter involving defeat . . . for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

The pretext of lodgings means: a dweller in such and such lodgings is seen [169] committing a matter involving defeat . . . for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. || 3 ||

With a charge involving defeat means: one of the four . . . (=Formal Meeting VIII. **2**) . . . a question arising out of obligations.

Taking up some point as a pretext means: taking up a certain pretext among these pretexts.

If the monk confesses his malice means: . . . (=Formal Meeting VIII. **2**) . . . because of this it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. || 4 || **2** ||

A monk is seen committing an offence which entails a formal meeting of the Order; in the offence which entails a formal meeting of the Order there is a wrong view as to an offence which entails a formal meeting of the Order. If he reprimands him for a matter involving defeat, saying: " You are not a (true) recluse . . . nor a ceremony performed by a chapter of monks," thus it is connected with a different kind of offence and a pretext is taken up: for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

A monk is seen committing an offence which entails a formal meeting of the Order; in the offence which

entails a formal meeting of the Order there is the wrong view that it is a grave offence . . . there is the wrong view that it is an offence requiring expiation . . . there is the wrong view that it is an offence which ought to be confessed . . . there is the wrong view that it is an offence of wrong-doing . . . there is the wrong view that it is an offence of evil speech. If he reprimands him . . . . for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

A monk is seen committing a grave offence . . . an offence requiring expiation . . . an offence which ought to be confessed . . . an offence of wrong-doing . . . an offence of evil speech; in the evil speech there is a wrong view of evil speech. If he reprimands him . . . for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

A monk is seen committing an offence of evil speech; there is the wrong view that in the offence of evil speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order; there is the wrong view that in the evil speech there is a grave offence, an offence requiring expiation, an offence which ought to be confessed, an offence of wrong-doing. If he reprimands him . . . for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

Beginning severally, the series, with this exception, should be put together. || 1 ||

A monk is seen committing an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order; in the offence which entails a formal meeting of the Order there is a wrong view as to an offence which entails a formal meeting of the Order. If he causes him to be reprimanded for an offence involving defeat, saying: "You are not a (true) recluse . . ." . . . for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

A monk is seen committing an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order; in the offence which entails a formal meeting of the Order there is a wrong view

that it is a grave offence . . . a wrong view that it is an offence of evil speech . . : a monk is seen committing an offence of evil speech . . . there is a wrong view that it is an offence of wrong-doing. If he causes him to be reprimanded . . . for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. || 2 ||

There is no offence if, thinking what is true,[1] he reprimands him or causes him to be reprimanded, if he is out of his mind, if he is a beginner. || 3 || **3** ||

Told[2] is the Ninth Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order [**170**]

[1] *Tathāsaññi, cf. tathāgata*, the "truth-finder."
[2] *Samatta*, instead of the more usual *niṭṭhita*.

FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHÂDISESA) X

. . . at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding place. And then Devadatta[1] came up to Kokālika,[2] and to Kaṭamorakatissaka, and to the son of the lady Khaṇḍā, and to Samuddadatta, and having come up he said to Kokālika, Kaṭamorakatissaka, and the son of the lady Khaṇḍā, and to Samuddadatta: "Now we, your reverences, will make a schism in the Order of the recluse Gotama, a breaking of the concord."[3]

When he had spoken thus Kokālika said to Devadatta: "Your reverence, the recluse Gotama has great psychic power, and great might. How can we make a schism in the Order of the recluse Gotama, a breaking of the concord?"

"Now we, your reverence, having approached the recluse Gotama, will beg for five items: 'Lord, the lord in many ways speaks in praise of desiring little, of being contented, of expunging (evil), of being punctilious, of what is gracious, of decrease (of the obstructions), of putting forth energy.[4] Lord, these five items are conducive in many ways to desiring little, to contentment, to expunging (evil), to being punctilious, to what is gracious,

---

[1] This story is given almost word for word at *Vin.* ii. 196 ff.

[2] These schismatics appear again in Formal Meeting XI. Mentioned at *Vin.* iv. 66, 335. At *S.* i. 149=*A.* v. 170=*Sn.*, p. 123, Kokālika tried to defame the two chief disciples.

[3] *Vin. Texts* iii. 251, "let us stir up a division in the samaṇa Gotama's saṅgha and in the body of his adherents," with n. that "in *cakka-bhedaṃ* the first word no doubt connotes 'kingship, lordship' as in dhamma-cakka, cakkavatti, etc." But it can also mean breaking a wheel, and symbolically *cakkabheda* has special meaning of "breaking up the peace, sowing discord."

[4] =*Vin.* i. 45=ii. 2=iii. 21=iv. 213.

to decrease (of the obstruction), to putting forth energy. It were good, lord, if the monks for as long as life lasted, should be forest-dwellers; whoever should betake himself to the neighbourhood of a village, sin[1] would besmirch[2] him. For as long as life lasts let them be beggars for alms;[3] whoever should accept an invitation, sin would besmirch him. For as long as life lasts let them be wearers of robes taken from the dust-heap; whoever should accept a robe given by a householder, sin would besmirch him.[4] For as long as life lasts let them live at the foot of a tree;[5] whoever should go under cover, sin would besmirch him. For as long as life lasts let them not eat fish and flesh;[6] whoever should eat fish and flesh, sin would besmirch him."

"The recluse Gotama will not allow these things. Then we will win over the people by means of these five items."

"It is possible, your reverence, with these five items, to make a schism in the Order of the recluse Gotama, a breaking of the concord. For, your reverence, people esteem austerity."[7] || 1 ||

Then Devadatta together with his friends went up to the lord, and having gone up and greeted the lord, he sat down to one side. As he was sitting to one side, Devadatta said to the lord: "Lord, the lord in many

---

[1] *vajja*.

[2] *phuseyya* from *phusati* to touch, not from *phusati* to sprinkle. *VA*. 603, "let hatred touch that monk, let the lord deal with him for the offence."

[3] Those who only eat the alms received in the begging-bowl.

[4] At *Vin*. i. 280 it is laid down that the monks may wear either the paŋsukula robes or accept lay robes, as they please.

[5] At *Vin*. i. 152 monks are forbidden to spend vassa out in the open.

[6] At *Vin*. i. 238 and below, p. 298, it is laid down that fish and meat are pure for the monks if they do not see, hear or suspect that it has been killed for them. *Cf*. pp. 98, 99 above, where there seems to be no offence in eating meat.

[7] *lūkhappasanna*, *cf*. *A*. ii. 71, where this is one of the four types of persons who estimate by and esteem outward form. Each type is explained at *Pug*. 53.

ways speaks in praise of desiring little . . . who should eat fish or flesh, sin would besmirch him."

"Enough, Devadatta," he said. "Whoever wishes, let him be a forest-dweller; whoever wishes, let him dwell in the neighbourhood of a village; whoever wishes, [171] let him be a beggar for alms; whoever wishes, let him accept an invitation; whoever wishes, let him wear rags taken from the dust-heap; whoever wishes, let him accept a householder's robes. For eight months, Devadatta, lodging at the foot of a tree is permitted by me.[1] Fish and flesh are pure in respect of three points: if they are not seen, heard or suspected (to have been killed for him[2])."

Then Devadatta thinking: "The lord does not allow these five items," was joyful and exultant.[3] He rose from his seat, and having greeted the lord, and paid homage to him keeping him on his right side, he departed together with his friends. Then Devadatta, entering Rājagaha, taught the people by means of the five items: "We, your reverences, having approached the recluse Gotama, begged for five items: 'Lord, the lord in various ways speaks in praise of desiring little . . . whoever should eat fish and flesh, sin would besmirch him.' The recluse Gotama does not

---

[1] *I.e.*, not in the four months of the rains.

[2] *VA.* 604, "not seen means, having killed deer and fish for the benefit of the monks, their being caught was not seen; not heard means, having killed . . . of the monks, the taking (of them) was not heard"; not suspected means, if the monks see men going from a village to the jungle with nets and snares in their hands; and if on the next day they receive fish and flesh with their alms in the village they suspect: "Was not this done for the benefit of the monks?" They ask the men, who deny it, and say it was done for their own benefit. Or the monks may hear it said that men are going out to the jungle with nets and snares, or they may neither see the hunters nor hear it said they that have gone out, but simply receive fish and flesh in their begging-bowls. The same doubts assail them, and they ask if the killing took place for their benefit. But if it was not done expressly for the monks' benefit, inasmuch as there is no doubt as to this, everything is quite in order.

[3] *VA.* 606, says he was joyful and exultant because he now thought he could cause a schism.

allow these. But we live in conformity with these five items." ||2||

Then those who were men of no faith, not virtuous, and of poor enlightenment, said: "These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are punctilious[1] and practise the expunging of evil; but the recluse Gotama is luxurious and strives after abundance."

Then those who were faithful, virtuous, clever, enlightened people became vexed, annoyed, angry and said: "How can this Devadatta go forward with a schism in the Order of the lord, with a breaking of the concord?"

Then the monks heard these people who were vexed, annoyed, angry. Those who were modest monks were . . . angry, and said: "How can this Devadatta go forward with a schism, with a breaking of the concord?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord.

He said: "Is it true, as is said, Devadatta, that you went forward with a schism in the Order, with a breaking of the concord?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying: "How can you, foolish man, go forward with a schism in the Order, with a breaking of the concord? It is not, foolish man, for the benefit of unbelievers . . . Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should go forward with a schism of the Order which is harmonious, or should persist in taking up some legal question leading to a dissension: that monk should be spoken to thus by the monks: 'Do not, venerable one, go forward with a schism of the Order which is harmonious, or persist in taking up some legal question leading to a dissension. Let the venerable

[1] *VA*. 607, they are *dhuta* because they are endowed with the *paṭipadā* which shakes off the *kilesas*; they are *sallekhavutti* because their course of life (*vutti*) reduces the *kilesas*.

one be associated with the Order; for the Order is harmonious, on friendly terms, not quarrelsome, it dwells comfortably under a single rule.'[1] And if that monk, after he has been spoken to thus by the monks, [**172**] should persist, that monk should be admonished up to three times by the monks together concerning his giving up such a course. Should he give it up after being admonished up to three times, this is good. Should he not give it up, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order." || 3 || || **1** ||

Whatever means: he who . . .

Monk means: . . . in this meaning is monk to be understood.

Harmonious means: an Order belonging to the same community[2] is established within the same boundary.[3]

Should go forward with a schism means: saying, "How should these folk be separated, how should they be separated, how should they be at variance?" seeking a faction, he gets a group together.

A legal question leading to a dissension means: the eighteen ways of causing a division.[4]

Taking up means: taking.

Leading to means: kindling.

---

[1] *I.e.*, not Gotama's authority, but that of the Pāṭimokkha rules. This word, *ekuddesa*, occurs in the Pārājikas in definition of *saṃvāsa*, communion.

[2] *VA*. 607. There is no separation as to mind.

[3] *VA*. 607. There is no separation as to body. Belonging to the same community means that there are none living together holding various heretical views or various religious proceedings; that there is no mental separation from those of the same mind. Within the same boundary means there is no bodily separation from those in bodily concord. For these expressions see also *Vin*. i. 321.

[4] These are given at *Vin*. ii. 204 and are the same as the eighteen things by which you may conclude that a monk is a speaker of what is not dhamma, *Vin*. i. 354. The first ten are also given at *A*. i. 19.

Should persist means: should not give up.

That monk means: that schismatic monk.

By the monks means: by other monks, whoever see, whoever hear; these should say: "Do not, venerable one, go forward with a schism of the Order which is harmonious, nor persist in taking up a legal question leading to a dissension. Let the venerable one be associated with the Order. The Order, harmonious, on friendly terms, not quarrelsome, dwells comfortably under a single rule." A second time they should say . . . A third time they should say . . . If he gives it up, this is good. If he does not give it up, it is an offence of wrong-doing. If having heard, they do not speak, there is an offence of wrong-doing. That monk, having been pulled to the middle of the Order, they are to say: "Do not, venerable one, go forward with a schism of the Order, which is harmonious, nor persist in taking up a legal question leading to a dissension. Let the venerable one be associated with the Order. The Order, harmonious . . . comfortably under a single rule." A second time they should say . . . A third time they should say . . . If he gives it up, that is good. If he does not give it up, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

That monk should be admonished. Thus, monks, should he be admonished: the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk: "Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk, so and so, proceeds with a schism of the Order which is harmonious. He does not give up this course. If it is the right time for the Order, let the Order admonish this monk, so and so, so that he may give up his course. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order hear me. This monk, so and so . . . does not give up his course. The Order [**173**] together admonishes the monk, so and so, that he may give up his course. If it seems good to the venerable ones, together admonishing this monk, so and so, that he should give up his course, be silent; if it does not seem good, then you should speak. A second time I speak this matter . . . A third time

I speak this matter . . . then you should speak. It has been said by the Order that the monk, so and so, should give up his course. It seems good to the Order . . . Thus do I understand."

According to the motion there is an offence of wrong-doing; according to the two resolutions[1] there are grave offences;[2] according to the end of a resolution there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. If he is committing an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, the offence of wrong-doing according to the motion and the grave offences according to the two resolutions, subside.[3]

An offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order means: . . . because of this it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. || **2** ||

Thinking a legally valid act[4] to be a legally valid act, he does not give it up, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. Being in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act, he does not give it up, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. Thinking an act which is not legally valid to be an act which is legally valid, he does not give it up, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. Thinking an act which is legally valid to be an act which is not legally valid, is an offence of wrong-doing. Being in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act, is an offence of wrong-doing. Not thinking an act which is legally valid to be an act which is not legally valid, is an offence of wrong-doing.[5] || 1 ||

[1] *kammavācā*, resolution; *ñatti*, motion, *cf. Vin.* i. 317 and *Vin. Texts* i. 169, n. 2; ii. 265, n. 2.

[2] *VA.* 609. He to whom these three offences do not seem good, should speak.

[3] =below, pp. 307, 313.

[4] *VA.* 609, "a legally valid act, an act which has been repeated together." An unlawful act is explained at *Vin.* i. 317 f. It is connected with *ñatti* and *kammavācā*.

[5] =below, pp. 307, 313.

There is no offence if he has not been admonished, if he gives it up, if he is mad, out of his mind, in pain, a beginner.[1] ‖ 2 ‖ ‖ **3** ‖

Told is the Tenth Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order: that of a schism in the Order

[1] =below, pp. 308, 313.

FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHÂDISESA) XI

. . . at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. At that time Devadatta proceeded to a schism in the Order, a breaking of the concord. The monks spoke thus: "Devadatta is not one who speaks dhamma, Devadatta is not one who speaks vinaya.[1] How can this Devadatta proceed with a schism in the Order, with a breaking of the concord?" Having spoken thus, Kokālika, Kaṭamorakatissa, and the son of the lady Khaṇḍā and Samuddadatta[2] said to these monks:

"Do not speak thus, venerable ones; [174] Devadatta is one who speaks dhamma, Devadatta is one who speaks vinaya, and Devadatta having adopted[3] our desire and objective, gives expression to them; he knows that what he says for us[4] seems also good to us."

Then those who were modest monks were . . . angry, and said: "How can these monks become those throwing in their lot with[5] and taking part in[6] Devadatta's proceeding for a schism in the Order?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord.

"Is it true as they say, monks, that (these) monks are those who are throwing in their lot with and taking part in Devadatta's proceeding for a schism in the Order?"

---

[1] At *D.* iii. 135 these words occur in a kind of definition of "Tathāgata."

[2] The same monks as in Formal Meeting X, above.

[3] *ādāya*, lit. having taken.

[4] *jānāti no bhāsati*, *VA.* 611, he knows our desires, and so on.

[5] *anuvattaka*, *VA.* 611, "those following him by taking up (his) opinions, pleasures, approvals."

[6] *vaggavādaka*. "They speak words not on the side of unanimity," *VA.* 611.

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "How, monks, can these foolish men become those to throw in their lot with, to take part in Devadatta's proceeding for a schism in the Order? It is not, monks, for the benefit of unbelievers . . . Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

If a monk has monks: one or two or three, who throw in their lot with him or take his part, and if these should speak thus: 'Do not, venerable ones, say anything against this monk; this monk is one who speaks dhamma, this monk is one who speaks vinaya; and this monk, adopting our desire and objective, gives expression to them; he knows that what he says for us seems also good to us.' These monks should be spoken to thus by monks: 'Do not, venerable ones, speak thus. This monk is not one who speaks dhamma, this monk is not one who speaks vinaya. Please do not let a schism in the Order seem good to the venerable ones; let the venerable ones be at one with the Order, for the Order being harmonious and on friendly terms, not quarrelsome, dwells comfortably under one rule.' If these monks having been spoken to by the monks should persist, then these monks should be admonished up to three times by these monks in a body, for giving up their course. If these, having been admonished up to three times, should give it up, that is good; if they should not give it up, that is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order." ||**1**||

If a monk means: if a schismatic monk.

Has monks means: has other monks.

Throw in their lot with means: he is one having that view, that allegiance, that objective; and these are those having that view, that allegiance, that objective.[1]

Take his part means: these are standing for his sort, his faction.

---

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 163, and *D.* i. 187; *M.* i. 487.

One or two or three means: there are one or two or three.

If these should speak thus means: "Do not, venerable ones, speak against this monk. This monk is one who speaks dhamma, and this monk is one who speaks vinaya, and this monk is one who having adopted our desire and allegiance, [**175**] gives expression to them. He knows that what he says for us seems also good to us."

These monks means: these monks who throw in their lot with.

By monks means: by other monks who see, and who hear. These should say: "Do not, venerable ones, speak thus. This monk is not one who speaks dhamma, and this monk is not one who speaks vinaya. Please do not let a schism in the Order seem good to the venerable ones. Let the venerable ones be at one with the Order; for the Order being harmonious and on friendly terms, not quarrelsome, dwells comfortably under one rule." A second time they should say . . . A third time they should say . . . if they give it up, that is good; if they do not give it up, it is an offence of wrong-doing.

These monks, having pulled them into the middle of the Order, should say: "Do not, venerable ones, speak thus. He is not . . . under one rule." A second time they should say . . . a third time they should say . . . if they give up their course it is good; if they do not give it up there is an offence of wrong-doing.

These monks should be admonished means: Thus, monks, they should be admonished . . . the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk: "Let the Order hear me, honoured sirs. Such and such monks, having thrown in their lot with such and such a monk, are taking his side in a proceeding for making a schism in the Order. These do not give up this course. If it is the right time for the Order, let the Order as a body admonish such and such monks about giving up this course. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order hear me: such and such monks . . . not give up the course. The Order as a body admonishes such and such monks about giving up this course. If

it seems good to the venerable ones to admonish such and such monks for giving up this course, you should be silent; if it does not seem good to you, you should speak. A second time I proclaim this matter. A third time I proclaim this matter . . . you should speak. Let the Order as a body admonish such and such monks for giving up this course. It seems good to the Order . . . Thus do I understand."

According to the motion there is an offence of wrong-doing; according to two resolutions there are grave offences; at the end of the resolution there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. If they are committing an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, the offence of wrong-doing according to the motion and the grave offences according to the two resolutions, subside.[1]

Two or three should be admonished together; further than that[2] they should not be admonished.

An offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order means: . . . because of that it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. || 2 || [176]

Thinking a legally valid act to be a legally valid act, they do not give it up, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. Being in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act, they do not give it up, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. Thinking an act which is not legally valid to be an act which is legally valid, they do not give it up, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. Thinking an act which is legally valid to be an act which is not a legally valid act, is an offence of wrong-doing. Being in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act, is an offence of wrong-doing. Not thinking an act which is legally valid to be an act which is not legally valid, is an offence of wrong-doing.[3] || 1 ||

[1] =above, p. 302; below, pp. 313, 327.
[2] *taduttari.*
[3] =above, p. 302; below, pp. 313, 327.

It is not an offence if they have not been admonished, if they give it up, if they are mad, out of their minds, in pain, beginners.[1] || 2 || **3** ||

Told is the Eleventh Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order: that of siding in with a schism

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 303; below, pp. 313, 327.

FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHÂDISESA) XII

. . . at Kosambī in Ghosita's park. At that time the venerable Channa[1] indulged in bad habits. The monks said: "Reverend Channa, do not do that, it is not suitable."[2]

He said: "What do you, your reverences, think should be said to me? It is I who should tell you.[3] The enlightened one is for us, dhamma is for us, dhamma is realised for us by a master.[4] Just as a great wind blowing would raise up grass, sticks, ferns and rubbish together; or just as a mountain-born[5] river would raise up various water plants[6] together, so you, having gone forth from various names, from various clans, from various lineages, from various families, are raised up together. What do you, your reverences, think should be said to me? It is I who should tell you. The enlightened one is for us, dhamma is for us, dhamma is realised for us by a master."

Then those who were modest monks were . . . angry, and said: "How can the venerable Channa, himself

---

[1] = *Vin.* iv. 141.　　[2] Also in Formal Meeting VII.

[3] *VA.* 612, "I am worthy to say to you: 'Do this, do not do that. For when, as our enlightened one, mounting Kanthaka (his horse), left the household life with me, I went forth into homelessness.'"

[4] *Ibid.* "The fourfold true things having been penetrated for us by a master (*ayyaputta*), dhamma is for us. But thinking that the Order was hostile to him, he did not say, 'The Order is for us.'"

[5] *pabbateyya, ibid.*, "Its source is on a mountain."

[6] *saṅkha-sevāla-paṇaka*: *saṅkha*, a water-plant, probably unidentified; *sevāla*=Blyxa octandra moss; *paṇaka* or *paṇṇaka* a name of a water-plant, most likely a fern (so *P.T.S. Dict.*). *VA.* 612, "*saṅkha* is called the leaf and the moss, with a long root; *sevāla* is dark *sevāla* (moss); the rest are water-plants, sesame plants and seeds; and everything that is to be styled a water-plant."

being spoken to by the monks in accordance with dhamma, reckon himself as one not to be spoken to?"

Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as they say, Channa, that you, yourself being spoken to by the monks in accordance with dhamma, reckon yourself as one not to be spoken to?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, yourself being spoken to by the monks in accordance with dhamma, reckon yourself as one not to be spoken to? It is not, foolish man, [**177**] for the benefit of unbelievers . . . Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

If a monk is one who is difficult to speak to,[1] and if himself being spoken to by the monks according to dhamma[2] concerning the courses of training included in the exposition,[3] he reckons himself as one not to be spoken to, saying: 'Do not say anything to me, venerable ones, either good or bad, and I will not say anything to the venerable ones, either good or bad; refrain, venerable ones, from speaking to me'—(then) that monk should be spoken to thus by the monks: 'Do not, venerable one, reckon yourself as one not to be spoken to; let the venerable one reckon himself as one to be spoken to; let the venerable one speak to the monks in accordance with dhamma,[4] and then the monks will

---

[1] *Dubbacajātika. VA.* 612, says that *dubbaca* means that it is impossible to speak to him. Edd. *Vin. Texts* i. 12 get nearer to this in their *note* than in their trans., which reads: "refuses to listen to what is said to him." I follow trans. at *G.S.* ii. 151 (of *A.* ii. 147) and at *K.S.* ii.137 (of *S.* ii. 206). But at *G.S.* iii. 133 (*A.* iii. 178) the reading is, "they are speakers of ill," and at *G.S.* v. 104 (*A.* v. 152), "of foul speech." But Channa, above, has given no indication that his speech was evil. Chalmers, *Fur. Dial.* i. 69 (*M.* i. 95), has "unruly," but *MA.* ii. 66 explains: *so dukkhena vattabbo hoti*, with which *cf. SA.* ii. 173, *dukkhaṃ vattabbā*.

[2] *Sahadhammikaṃ*, here adverbial. *VA.* 613, "according to the courses of training made known by the enlightened one." For similar use, see *Vin.* i. 60; iv. 141.

[3] *I.e.*, in the Pātimokkha, see below, *Old Comy.*

[4] *Saha dhammena.*

speak to the venerable one in accordance with dhamma. Thus is the multitude increased for the lord, that is to say by speaking with one another, by assisting one another.[1] And if that monk when he has been spoken to by the monks should persist as before, then that monk should be admonished up to three times by the monks together for giving up his course. And if after being admonished up to three times by the monks together, he gives up his course, that is good; if he does not give it up, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order." ||**1**||

If a monk is one who is difficult to speak to means: he is difficult to speak to, endowed with qualities which make him difficult to speak to,[2] intractable,[3] incapable of being instructed.[4]

In the courses of training included in the exposition means: in the courses of training included in the Pātimokkha.

By the monks means: by other monks.

According to dhamma means: that course of training made known by the lord, this is called according to dhamma.

Himself being spoken to he reckons himself as one not to be spoken to, saying: "Do not, venerable ones, say

---

[1] *Aññamañña-vuṭṭhāpanena*, trans. at *Vin. Texts* i. 12, "by mutual help." *Vuṭṭhāpeti* is also to ordain, to rehabilitate, *cf. Vin.* iv. 226, 317, where *vuṭṭhāpeti=upasampādeti* in *Old Comy.*

[2] *VA.* 612, "endowed with these conditions, they make a man difficult to talk to." There are said to be, *loc. cit.*, nineteen such conditions enumerated here; sixteen at *MA.* ii. 66.

[3] *Akkhama, VA.* 613, "he does not submit to, does not endure the exhortation."

[4] *Appadakkhiṇaggāhī anusāsaniṃ*, lit. a left-handed (*i.e.*, unskilled, clumsy) taker of the teaching. They do not take the teaching with deference, but disrespectfully (*cf. VA.* 613 and *MA.* ii. 66), possibly also referring to the fact that they do not (depart) keeping the right side towards the teacher, which is *padakkhiṇaṃ karoti.*

This whole phrase is stock, occurring at, *e.g., S.* ii. 204; *A.* ii. 147; iii. 178; v. 152; *M.* i. 95.

anything to me, either good or bad, and I will not say anything to the venerable ones, either good or bad; refrain, venerable ones, from speaking to me"—(*then*) *that monk* means: that monk who is difficult to speak to.

By the monks means: by other monks, these see, these hear. He should be spoken to by these, saying: "Venerable one, do not reckon yourself as one not to be spoken to, let the venerable one reckon himself as one to be spoken to, let the venerable one speak to the monks in accordance with dhamma, and then the monks will speak to the venerable one in accordance with dhamma. Thus is the multitude increased for the lord, that is to say by speaking to one another, by assisting one another." A second time he should be spoken to . . . A third time he should be spoken to . . . If [**178**] he gives it up, that is good; but if he does not give it up, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, having heard, they do not speak, there is an offence of wrong-doing. That monk, having been pulled into the middle of the assembly, should be told: "Do not, venerable one, reckon yourself as one not to be spoken to . . . by ordaining one another." A second time he should be told . . . A third time he should be told . . . If he gives it up, that is good; if he does not give it up, there is an offence of wrong-doing. That monk should be admonished. And thus, monks, should he be admonished. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk: "Honoured sirs, let the Order hear me. This monk, so and so, being remonstrated with by the monks in accordance with dhamma, reckons himself as one not to be spoken to: he does not give up this course. If it is the right time for the Order, let the Order admonish this monk so that he may give up this course. That is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order hear me. This monk, so and so . . . Thus do I understand."

According to the motion there is an offence of wrong-doing; according to the two resolutions there are grave offences; at the end of a resolution there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. If he is com-

mitting an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, the offence of wrong-doing according to the motion and the grave offences according to the two resolutions, subside.[1]

An offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order means: . . . on account of this it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. || **2** ||

Thinking a legally valid act to be a legally valid act, he does not give it up, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. Being in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act . . . Not thinking an act that is legally valid to be an act that is not legally valid is an offence of wrong-doing.[2] || 1 ||

There is no offence if he has not been admonished, if he gives it up, if he is mad, if he is a beginner.[3] || 2 || **3** ||

Told is the Twelfth Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order: that concerning one to whom it is difficult to speak

---

[1] =above, pp. 302, 307; below, p. 327.
[2] *Cf.* above, pp. 302, 307; below, p. 327.
[3] *Cf.* above, pp. 303, 308; below, p. 327.

FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHÂDISESA) XIII

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's park. Now at that time,[1] unscrupulous, depraved monks who were the followers of Assaji and Punabbasu[2] were in residence[3] at Kiṭāgiri.[4] They indulged in the following kinds of bad habits: they planted and caused to be planted small flowering trees; they watered them [179] and caused them to be watered; they plucked them and caused them to be plucked; they tied them up into (garlands) and caused them to be tied up; they made and caused to be made garlands having a stalk on one side[5]; they made and caused to be made garlands having a stalk on both sides[6]; they made and caused to be made a branching flower-stalk[7]; they made and caused to be

[1] This whole passage=*Vin.* ii. 10 ff.

[2] *VA.* 614, " they were the foremost of the sixfold group of monks" —the bad group, often giving trouble. " They say, 'alms in the countryside are now abundant, now short. Let us not live in one place but in three places.' So they chose Kāsī of the kingdom of Kosala, Aṅga of the kingdom of Magadha, and Kiṭāgiri. They did things not to be done and neglected the courses of training which had been set forth. So they are called ' unscrupulous, evil monks.' " At *VA.* 579 (on *Vin.* iii. 160) it is said that Mettiya and Bhummajaka are the leaders of the sixfold group.

[3] *āvāsika. VA.* 613, *āvāso ti vihāro.* " *Avāsikā* are those to whom this *āvāsa* belongs, for they have the care of the new buildings and the repairs to the old: these are the residents. Those who only stay in a vihāra are called inmates (*nevāsika*), but these were residents (*āvāsikā*)." *MA.* iii. 187 defines *āvāsikā* as *nibandhavāsino*, " continual dwellers."

[4] *VA.* 613, " that was the name of the countryside," while *MA.* iii. 186 says, " that was the name of the township."

[5] *ekatovaṇṭikamāla. VA.* 617, " a garland made with the stalks on one side of the flowers."

[6] *ubhatovaṇṭikamāla. Ibid.*, " a garland made with the stalks of the flowers on both sides."

[7] *mañjarika. Ibid.*, " an arrangement of flowers."

made a wreath[1]; they made and caused to be made a garland worn round the forehead[2]; they made and caused to be made an ear-ornament; they made and caused to be made a breast-plate.[3] These (monks) take or send garlands having a stalk on one side to wives of reputable families, to daughters of reputable families, to girls of reputable families, to daughters-in-law of reputable families, to female slaves of reputable families. They take or send garlands having a stalk on both sides; they take or send a branching flower-stalk; they take or send a wreath; they take or send a garland worn round the forehead; they take or send an ear-ornament; they take or send a breast-plate. These eat from one dish together with wives of reputable families, with daughters of reputable families, with girls of reputable families, with daughters-in-law of reputable families, with female slaves of reputable families. They drink from one beaker; they sit down on one seat; they share[4] one couch; they share one mat[5]; they share one coverlet; they share one mat and coverlet. They eat at the wrong time; they drink intoxicants; they wear garlands, (use) perfumes and cosmetics; they dance and sing and play musical instruments, and they sport. They dance when she dances,[6] they sing when she dances, they play musical instruments when she dances, they sport when she dances; they dance when she sings . . . they dance when she plays musical instruments . . . they dance when she sports . . . they sport when she sports. || 1 ||

---

[1] *vidhutika*. *Ibid.*, "It is done by piercing the flowers of the Vitex negundo tree (*sinduvara*) with a needle or small stick."

[2] *vaṭaṃsaka*. *Comy.* of no use here. Sometimes as at *Vv.* 38 an ear-ornament=*kaṇṇikā*, *VvA.* 174. But here next item, *āveḷa* =*kaṇṇikā*, *VA.* 617.

[3] *uracchada*. *VA.* 617, "floral garlands like a *hāra* to be put on the breast."

[4] *VA.* 620, "they lie down on."

[5] *attharaṇa*, lit. strewing, spreading (neut.). Hence probably a mat or rug, or even something spread over them, some cover.

[6] *VA.* 620, "when a nautch-girl dances, they go dancing in front of her or behind her."

They play[1] on a chequered board for gambling[2]; they play on a draught-board[3]; they play with imagining such boards in the air[4]; they play a game of keeping stepping on to diagrams[5]; they play with spillikans[6]; they play at dice; they play tip-cat[7]; they play brush-hand[8]; they play with a ball[9]; they play at blowing through toy-pipes made of leaves[10]; they play with a toy plough[11]; they play at turning somersaults[12]; they play with a toy windmill[13]; they play with a toy measures

[1] For these games *cf. D.* i. 6 ff., and see *Dial.* i. 11 ff. for discussions on the terms.

[2] *aṭṭhapada. VA.* 620, "they play at dice on the chequered board," having eight squares on each side.

[3] *dasapada—i.e.*, a board with ten squares on each side. *Comy.* on this passage to "deformities," below=*DA.* i. 85 f.

[4] *VA.* 620, "as they play on the dice or draught board, so they play in space."

[5] *parihārapatha. VA.* 621=*DA.* i. 85, "having drawn a circle with various lines on the ground, there they play avoiding the line to be avoided."

[6] *santikāya kīḷanti. VA.* 621, "putting together chessmen and little stones into heaps, they move them away and put (new ones) with the nails without letting them tremble; but if one trembles there is defeat."

[7] *ghaṭikena kīḷanti, VA.* 621, "they move about hitting a short stick with a long stick."

[8] *salākahatthena kīḷanti, VA.* 621=moistening the brush-hand in crimson lac or in floury water, and beating it on the ground or on a wall, he says, "'What shall it be?' and they play showing the form required"—elephants and horses.

[9] *akkhena kīḷanti, VA.* 621, *guḷena,* with a ball. *Tr. Crit. Pali Dict.* says *akkha* is a die.

[10] *paṅgacīrena kīḷanti, VA.* 621, "they play blowing that leafy pipe."

[11] *vaṅkakena kīḷanti, VA.* 621, "they play with the plaything, the small plough of village boys." *v.ll. caṅgakena, vaṅgakena.*

[12] *mokkhacikāya kīḷanti,* derivation extremely obscure, see art. *P.T.S. Dict.* and *J.P.T.S.* 1885, p. 49. *VA.* 621 says "it is called a game of rolling about (*samparivattaka*)" (*cf. Jā.* ii. 142). "Holding a stick in the air, and putting the head on the ground, they play turning about by being upside down." At *Vin.* i. 275 the son of a great merchant disabled himself by playing this way. See also *Vin. Texts* ii. 184, n.

[13] *ciṅgulakena kīḷanti, VA.* 621, "a wheel that is made of the leaves of palm-trees and so on; the wheel reels round at a breath of wind—they play with this." On *ciṅgulaka* see *J.P.T.S.* 1885, p. 50.

of leaves[1]; they play with a toy cart[2]; they play with a toy bow[3]; they play a game of guessing at letters[4]; they play a mind-reading game[5]; they play a game of mimicking deformities[6]; they train themselves in elephant lore[7]; they train themselves in horse lore[7]; they train themselves in cart lore; they train themselves in archery; they train themselves in swordsmanship; then they run in front of an elephant, they run in front of a horse and they run in front of a chariot; now they run backwards, now they run forwards,[8] and they whistle,[9] and they snap their fingers,[10] and they wrestle,[11] and they fight with fists, and having spread out their upper robes as

---

[1] *pattâḷhakena kīḷanti*, *VA*. 621, *pattâḷhakaṃ vuccati paṇṇanāḷikā*, and it also says, "they play measuring the leafy pipe with this sand and so on." On the measures, *āḷhaka* and *nāḷikā*, see above, p. 103.

[2] *rathakena*, *VA*. 621, with a little cart.

[3] *dhanukena kīḷanti*, *VA*. 621, "with a little bow." These last six and "tip-cat" are given as examples of childish games at *M*. i. 266=*A*. v. 203=*Miln*. 230.

[4] *akkharikāya kīḷanti*, *VA*. 621, "they play the game of recognising syllables in the air or on their backs."

[5] *manesikāya*, *VA*. 621, "they play the game of knowing the mind and thoughts."

[6] *yathāvajjena kīḷanti*. This means the blind, the lame, the deformed and so on: imitating that which is a deformity, they play the game of exhibiting it.

[7] *VA*. 621, "they learn the learning which is to be learnt for the (craft and care) of elephants" and horses.

[8] *dhāvanti pi ādhāvanti*, *VA*. 621, *dhāvanti pî ti parammukhā gacchantā dhāvanti. Ādhāvanti pî ti yattakaṃ dhāvanti tattakaṃ eva abhimukhā puna āgacchantā ādhāvanti.*

[9] *usseḷhenti*. So far this word appears only to come here and at the parallel passage, *Vin*. ii. 10. The translators at *Vin. Texts* ii. 349, n. 1, "are quite uncertain how to render this word." I admit I do not agree with their rendering, "they used to exhibit signs of anger," as I think that all these activities were entered upon in a friendly spirit. See *P.T.S. Dict.* under *seḷeti*; also Morris, *J.P.T.S.*, 1885, p. 54, who is inclined to think *usselheti* is connected with *seleti*, and signifies "to shout out." *SnA*. 485 (on *Sn*. 682) explains *seḷenti* as *mukhena usselanasaddaṃ muñcanti*.

[10] Here, and at *Vin*. ii. 10, *appoṭhenti*. *P.T.S. Dict.* gives only *apphoṭeti*, with meaning of "to snap the fingers or clap the hands." But at *Miln*. 13, 20 *appoṭhe°* is given as a variant reading, also *apphoṭhe°*.

[11] *VA*. 622, "they make a wrestling contest."

a stage,[1] they say to a dancing girl: "Dance here, sister," and they applaud,[2] and indulge in various bad habits. ||2||

At one time a certain monk, rising up from spending the rains among the people of Kāsī, and going to Sāvatthī for the sake of seeing the lord, [**180**] arrived at Kiṭāgiri. Then this monk getting up early and taking his bowl and robe entered Kiṭāgiri for alms-food. He was pleasing whether he was approaching or departing, whether he was looking before or looking behind, whether he was drawing in or stretching out (his arm),[3] his eyes were cast down, he was possessed of pleasant behaviour.[4]

People seeing this monk, spoke thus:

"Who can this be like an idiot of idiots, like a fool of fools, like a very supercilious person?[5] Who will go up to him and give him alms? Our masters, the followers of Assaji and Punabbasu are polite,[6] genial, pleasant of speech, beaming with smiles, saying: 'Come, you are welcome.' They are not supercilious, they are easily accessible, they are the first to speak.[7] Therefore alms should be given to these."

A certain lay follower saw that monk wandering in Kiṭāgiri for alms; seeing that monk he approached him, and having approached and greeted him, he said:

"Honoured sir, are alms obtainable?"

---

[1] *raṅgamajjha*; *cf.* *S.* iv. 306, *Jā.* iv. 495.

[2] *nalāṭikam denti*, which *P.T.S. Dict.* says, "gives a frown." But Bu. at *VA.* 622 says, "they say, 'Very good, sister,' and placing their fingers on their own foreheads they then place them on her forehead."

[3] From "he was pleasing" is more or less stock, *cf.*, *e.g.*, *M.* iii. 35, 90; *D.* i. 70; *A.* ii. 104, 106, 210.

[4] *iriyāpatha* can mean "good behaviour" besides the postures, of which there are four.

[5] *bhākuṭikabhākuṭiko.* *VA.* 622, "having frowned when he cast down his eyes, they say that he goes about like an angry man with his mouth clenched." These last two words are in Pali *kuṭitamukha*, for which there are *v.ll.* *saṅkuṭi°*, *saṅkuci°*.

[6] *saṇha=nipuṇa.* "They greet a lay woman and are not like a fool of fools," so *VA.* 622.

[7] *Cf.* *D.* i. 116 for some of these words.

" Alms are not obtainable, your reverence," he said. " Come, honoured sir, we will go to my house." || 3 ||

Then the lay follower having taken this monk to his house and made him eat, said:

" Where, honoured sir, will the master go ?"

" I will go to Sāvatthī, your reverence, to see the lord," he said.

" Then, honoured sir, in my name salute the lord's feet with your head and say: 'Lord, the residence at Kiṭāgiri has been corrupted. At Kiṭāgiri are residing unscrupulous, depraved monks who are the followers of Assaji and Punabbasu. These indulge in the following bad habits . . . they indulge in a variety of bad habits. Lord, those men who formerly had faith and were virtuous now have no faith and are not virtuous. Those who formerly were channels for gifts[1] to the Order are now cut off; they neglect the well-behaved monks, and the depraved monks stay on. It were good, lord, if the lord would send monks to Kiṭāgiri, so that this residence in Kiṭāgiri may be settled."[2] || 4 ||

" Very well, your reverence," and that monk having answered and rising up from his seat, departed for Sāvatthī. In due course he approached Sāvatthī, the Jeta Grove and Anāthapiṇḍika's park and the lord; and having approached and greeted the lord, he sat down to one side. It is usual for enlightened ones, for lords, to exchange greetings with in-coming monks. So the lord said to this monk:

" I hope, monk, that it is going well with you, I hope that you are keeping going, I hope that you have accomplished your journey with but little fatigue. And where do you come from, monk ?"

" Things go well, lord, I am keeping going, lord, and I, lord, [181] accomplished my journey with but little

---

[1] *dānapatha.*

[2] *saṇṭhaheyya*; or, may be put in order, may continue, may be established.

fatigue. Now, I, lord, having spent the rains among the people of Kāsī, and coming to Sāvatthī for the sake of seeing the lord, arrived at Kiṭāgiri. Then I, lord, rising up early, and taking my bowl and robe, entered Kiṭāgiri for alms-food. Then, lord, a certain lay follower saw me as I was wandering in Kiṭāgiri for alms-food, and seeing me he approached, and having approached and greeted me, he said: 'Are alms obtainable, honoured sir?' 'No, your reverence, alms are not obtainable,' I said. 'Come, honoured sir, we will go to my house,' he said. Then, lord, that lay follower, taking me to his house and feeding me, said: 'Where, honoured sir, will the master go?' I said: 'Your reverence, I will go to Sāvatthī for the sake of seeing the lord.' Then he said . . . 'may be settled.' Therefore, lord, do I come." || 5 ||

Then the lord, on that occasion, in that connection, having had the Order of monks convened, asked the monks:

"Monks, is it true as is said, that the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu, residing in Kiṭāgiri, are unscrupulous and depraved and indulge in the following bad habits: they plant small flowering trees . . . indulge in a variety of bad habits . . . and those men, monks . . . and the depraved monks stay on?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can these foolish men indulge in this kind of bad habit, how can they plant small flowering trees or cause them to be planted? How can they water them or cause them to be watered? How can they pluck them or cause them to be plucked? How can they tie up garlands or cause them to be tied up? How can they make or cause to be made . . . How can they take or send . . . How can they eat . . . How can they drink . . . sit . . . stand . . . eat . . . drink . . . run . . . dance and sing and play musical in-

struments and sport . . . play . . . train themselves . . . run . . . run round facing . . . how can they whistle and snap their fingers and wrestle and fight with fists, and having spread out their upper robes as a stage, say to a nautch girl: 'Dance here, sister,' and applaud and indulge in a variety of bad habits? It is not, monks, for the benefit of unbelievers . . ." and having rebuked them and given them talk on dhamma, he addressed Sāriputta and Moggallāna:

"You go, Sāriputta[1] and Moggallāna; and having gone to Kiṭāgiri make an act of banishment[2] from Kiṭāgiri against those monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu; these are fellow monks of yours."[3]

They said: "Lord, how can we [182] make an act of banishment from Kiṭāgiri against the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu? These monks are violent and rough."

"Then, Sāriputta and Moggallāna, go together with many monks."

"Very well, lord," Sāriputta and Moggallāna answered the lord. || 6 ||

"And this, monks, is how it should be done. First, the monks who are the followers of Assaji and Punabbasu should be reproved; having been reproved they should be reminded; having been reminded they should be accused of the offence; having been accused of the offence, the Order should be informed through an experienced, competent monk: 'Let the Order listen to me, honoured sirs. These monks who are followers of

[1] *Sāriputtā*. Use of *karotha* and later *karoma* clearly indicates that both the chief disciples are meant. *Cf. Vin.* i. 351 for similar use of *Anuruddhā*.

[2] *pabbājaniyakamma*. This is directed against those who bring families into disrepute.

[3] *saddhivihārino*. At *Vin.* ii. 171 the followers of Assaji and Punabbasu refused to prepare lodgings for Sāriputta and Moggallāna saying that they were men of evil desires. This Assaji is not the same as he who converted Sāriputta and Moggallāna to the teaching of the lord.

Assaji and Punabbasu are those who bring a family into disrepute, they are of evil conduct; their evil conduct is seen and also heard, and respectable families corrupted by them are seen and also heard. If it seems the right time for the Order, let the Order make an act of banishment from Kiṭāgiri against the monks who are the followers of Assaji and Punabbasu, so that the monks who are the followers of Assaji and Punabbasu may not be in Kiṭāgiri. This is the motion. Let the Order listen to me, honoured sirs. These monks who are . . . seen and also heard. The Order issues an act of banishment from Kiṭāgiri against the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu so that the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu may not be in Kiṭāgiri. If it seems good to the venerable ones to make an act of banishment from Kiṭāgiri against the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu so that the monks who are the followers of Assaji and Punabbasu may not be in Kiṭāgiri, then be silent; if it does not seem good (to you) then you should speak. A second time I speak forth this matter . . . And a third time do I speak forth this matter: Let the Order listen to me . . . should speak. By the Order there has been made an act of banishment from Kiṭāgiri against the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu so that the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu may not be in Kiṭāgiri. If it seems good to the Order, then be silent; so do I understand." || 7 ||

Then[1] Sāriputta and Moggallāna, at the head of a company of monks, having gone to Kiṭāgiri made an act of banishment from Kiṭāgiri against the monks who were followers of Assaji and Punabbasu, so that the monks who were followers of Assaji and Punabbasu might not be in Kiṭāgiri. The act of banishment having been made by the Order, these did not conduct them-

[1] *Vin.* ii. 13 here has some matter not given at *Vin.* iii. 183. But the story continues in *Vin.* ii. 14 as above.

selves properly,[1] nor did they become subdued,[2] nor did they mend their ways,[3] they did not ask the monks for forgiveness,[4] they cursed them,[5] they reviled them,[6] they offended by following a wrong course through desire, by following a wrong course through hatred, by following a wrong course through stupidity, by following a wrong course through fear[7]; and they went away, and they left the Order.[8]

Those who were modest monks became angry . . . and annoyed, and said: "How can the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu, banished by the

[1] *VA*. 625, "they did not do well in the eighteen duties."

[2] "Through not following a suitable course they are not subdued," *VA*. 625, and taking the *v.ll. paṇṇalomā, pannalomā* instead of *pana na loma*, as given in the printed edition of the *VA*. *P.T.S. Dict.* says, *lomaṃ pāteti* means to let the hair drop, as a sign of modesty or subduedness. By this must be meant some analogy with an animal (such as a dog or cat) who, having raised the fur (*loma*), lets it fall back as a sign of good temper restored. Hence this phrase is almost certainly meant to be taken metaphorically. In *Comy.* on *Vin.* ii. 5 (see *Vin.* ii. 309), where this same expression occurs, Bu. explains *lomaṃ pātenti* by *pannalomā honti*, which means those whose down is flat, not standing up in excitement, and whose minds are therefore subdued. *Cf.* "he takes up the wrong course," *MA*. iii. 153 on *M*. i. 442.

[3] *Na netthāraṃ vattanti.* *VA*. 625, "they did not follow the way of the overcoming of self." *Comy.* on *Vin.* ii. 5, given at *Vin.* ii. 309, is fuller: *netthāraṃ vattantî ti nittharantānaṃ etan ti netthāraṃ yena sakkā nissāraṇā nittharituṃ taṃ aṭṭhārasavidhaṃ sammāvattaṃ vattantî ti attho.* Same phrase occurs at *M*. i. 442, trans. at *Fur. Dial.* i. 316 "fails to atone," but this rendering is, I think, too Christian in tone to fit. *MA*. iii. 153 on *M*. i. 442 says: *na nitthāraṃ vattatî ti nitthāraṇakavattam hi na vattati āpattivuṭṭhānatthaṃ turitaturito chandajāto na hoti.* *v.l. nitthāra*, as at *M*. i. 442.

[4] *VA*. 625, "'we have done badly, we will not do so again, forgive us.' They did not ask for forgiveness."

[5] *Ibid.*, "They swore at those who did the commission of the Order with the ten expressions of cursing." These are given at *DhA*. i. 211-212.

[6] *Ibid.*, "They made dread appear in these."

[7] These are the four so-called *agatis*. At *D*. iii. 133=*A*. iv. 370, they occur among the nine "Impossibles" (*abhabbaṭṭhāna*) for a monk who is *khīṇâsava*. The *agati*-formula is stock; *cf.*, *e.g.*, *Vin.* i. 283; ii. 167, 176, 177; iii. 238, 246; *D*. iii. 182, 228; *A*. i. 72; ii. 18; iii. 274.

[8] *vibbhamanti.* *VA*. 625 says, *ekacce gihī honti.* *Cf.* p. 60, n. 3.

Order, not conduct themselves properly, not become subdued, not mend their ways? [183] Why do they not ask for forgiveness from the monks? Why do they curse and revile them? Why do they, following a wrong course through desire, hatred, stupidity and fear, go away and leave the Order?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord.[1]

He asked: "Is it true as is said, monks, that the monks who are the followers of Assaji and Punabbasu, having been banished by the Order, do not conduct themselves properly . . . leave the Order?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying . . . "And thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

If a monk lives depending on a certain village or little town, and is one who brings a family into disrepute and is of depraved conduct, and if his evil conduct is seen and heard, and families corrupted by him are seen and also heard, let that monk be spoken to thus by the monks: 'The venerable one is one who brings families into disrepute, and is of depraved conduct. The venerable one's depraved doings are seen and heard, and families corrupted by the venerable one are seen and also heard. Let the venerable one depart from this residence; you have lived here long enough.' And if this monk having been spoken to thus by the monks should say to these monks: 'The monks are followers of desire and the monks are followers of hatred and the monks are followers of stupidity and the monks are followers of fear; they banish some for such an offence, they do not banish others'—this monk should be spoken to thus by the monks: 'Venerable one, do not speak thus. The monks are not followers of desire and the monks are not followers of hatred and the monks are not followers of stupidity and the monks are not fol-

[1] Here at *Vin.* iii. 184, the next normal step is omitted: "Then the lord on that occasion, in that connection, having convened the Order of monks, asked the monks." This is given at parallel passage, *Vin.* ii. 14.

lowers of fear. The venerable one is one who brings families into disrepute and is of depraved conduct. The depraved doings of the venerable one are seen and heard, and families corrupted by the venerable one are seen and also heard. Let the venerable one depart from this residence; the venerable one has dwelt in this residence long enough.' If this monk, when spoken to thus by the monks, should persist as before, that monk should be admonished up to three times by the monks for giving up his course. If after being admonished up to three times, he gives up that course, it is good. If he does not give it up, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order." || 8 || **1** ||

A monk (is dependent on) *a certain village or a little town* means: a village and a little town and a city, and thus a village and a little town.

Lives depending on means: there they are dependent for the requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings and medicine for the sick.

A family means: there are four kinds of families: a noble family, a brahmin [**184**] family, a merchant family, a low-caste family.[1]

One who brings a family into disrepute means: he brings families into disrepute by means of a flower[2] or a fruit[3] or with chunam or clay or with a toothpick or with bamboo or with medical treatment[4] or with going messages on foot.[5]

---

[1] = *Vin.* iv. 272.

[2] *VA.* 626, a monk must not steal a flower from lay followers in order to make a gift or to offer in worship at a cetiya, or to give to people to use in worship; and it is not right to urge people to use flowers in worship.

[3] *Ibid.*, a fruit means his own property, which he can give to his parents and relations; but he must not give his own property or that of others to win favour with families, but to sick men or to lords who have arrived, or to those whose earnings are destroyed.

[4] *VA.* 628, "here it is the art of medical treatment as explained in the Commentary on the Third Pārājika."

[5] *Ibid.*, "taking up a householder's order—this should not be done; taking it up and going is a dukkaṭa offence for each step."

Of depraved conduct means: he plants or causes to be planted a little flowering tree; he waters it and causes it to be watered; he plucks it and causes it to be plucked; he ties up garlands and causes them to be tied up.

Are seen and also heard means: those who are face to face with them see; those who are absent hear.

Families corrupted by him means: formerly they had faith, now thanks to him they are without faith; having been virtuous, now they are without virtue.

Are seen and also heard means: those who are face to face with them see; those who are absent hear.

That monk means: that monk who brings a family into disrepute.

By the monks means: by other monks; these see, these hear; it should be said by these: 'The venerable one is one who brings families into disrepute and is of depraved conduct; the venerable one's depraved conduct . . . has lived here long enough.' And if the monk being spoken to thus by the monks should say: '. . . they do not banish others'; *this monk* means, this monk against whom proceedings have been taken.

By the monks means: by other monks; these see, these hear; it should be said by these: 'Do not, venerable one, speak thus . . . the venerable one has lived here long enough.' A second time should they say . . . A third time should they say . . . if he gives up the course that is good; if he does not give it up it is an offence of wrong-doing. If, having heard, they do not speak, there is an offence of wrong-doing. That monk having been drawn into the middle of the Order, should be told: 'Do not, venerable one, speak thus . . . you have lived here long enough.' A second time he should be told . . . A third time he should be told . . . if he gives up his course it is good, but if he does not give it up there is an offence of wrong-doing.

That monk should be admonished. The Order should be informed through an experienced, competent monk: 'Let the Order listen to me, honoured sirs. This monk,

so and so, banished by an act of the Order, makes the monks fall into wrong courses by following desire, by following hatred, by following confusion, by following fear; and he does not give up his course. If it seems the right time to the Order, let the Order admonish this monk for the sake of giving up his course. This is the motion. Let the Order listen to me . . . Thus do I understand.

According to the motion there is an offence of wrong-doing . . . grave offences subside.

An offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order means: the Order places him on probation on account of his offence, it sends him back to the beginning, it inflicts the mānatta discipline, it rehabilitates; it is not many people, it is not [**185**] one man, therefore it is called an offence which in the earlier as well as in the later stages requires a formal meeting of the Order. A synonym for this class of offence is a work; therefore, again, it is called an offence which in the earlier as well as in the later stages entails a formal meeting of the Order.[1] || **2** ||

Thinking a legally valid act to be a legally valid act, he does not give it up—there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. Being in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act . . . Not thinking an act which is legally valid to be an act which is not legally valid, is an offence of wrong-doing.[2] || 1 ||

It is not an offence if he is not admonished, if he gives it up, if he is mad, if he is a beginner. || 2 || **3** ||

Told is the Thirteenth Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order: that of bringing families into disrepute

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 196. [2] *Cf.* pp. 302, 307, 313.

The thirteen matters which require a formal meeting of the Order have been set down, venerable ones—nine which become offences at once,[1] and four which are not completed until the third admonition.[2]

If a monk offends against one or other of these, for as many days as he knowingly conceals his offence,[3] for so many days should probation be spent by this monk, even against his will.[4] When this monk has spent his probation, a further six days are to be allowed for the monk's mānatta discipline. If, when the monk has performed the mānatta discipline, the company of monks numbers twenty, that monk may be rehabilitated.[5] But if the Order of monks should rehabilitate that monk when numbering less than twenty even by one, that monk is not rehabilitated and these monks are blameworthy. This is the proper course there. Now I ask the venerable ones: I hope that you are pure in this matter?[6] A second time I ask: I hope that you are pure in this matter? A third time I ask: I hope that you are pure in this matter? The venerable ones are pure in this matter, therefore they are silent. Thus do I understand.[7]

Told are the thirteen. The summary of this is:

Emission and bodily contact; lewd talk and one's own pleasure,
Acting as a go-between; and a hut, and a vihāra; without foundation,/

---

[1] *paṭhamâpattikā.*

[2] *yāvatatiyakā*: name of the last four Saṅghâdisesas, where before punishment can be inflicted, the monks must have been admonished so as to give up their wrong courses, even up to the third time.

[3] *VA.* 629, "for as many days as he knowingly conceals his offence, saying: 'I have fallen into such and such an offence,' and does not tell his co-religionists."

[4] *Ibid.*, taking up probation (*parivāsa*) it may be spent unwillingly, not under his power.

[5] *Abbheti*, to rehabilitate after suspension for breach of rules.

[6] *I.e.*, of being at least a group of twenty.

[7] For this passage *cf. Vin.* iv. 242.

And some point, and a schism, even siding in with,
Difficult to speak to, and bringing a family into disrepute—these are the thirteen offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

Told are the thirteen sections **[186]**

[These two Undetermined Matters, venerable ones, come up for exposition.]

UNDETERMINED (ANIYATA) I

At one time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Sāvatthī in Anāthapiṇḍika's park in the Jeta Grove. At that time the venerable Udāyin was dependent on families in Sāvatthī and approached many families. Now at that time the young girl of a family who was supporting the venerable Udāyin had been given (in marriage) to a boy of a certain family. Then the venerable Udāyin, getting up early and taking his bowl and robe, approached that family, and having approached them he asked the people:

"Where is (the girl) called so and so?" They said: "Honoured sir, she was given to a boy of a certain family." Now this family supported the venerable Udāyin. Then the venerable Udāyin approached this family, and having approached them he asked the people:

"Where is (the girl) called so and so?" They said: "Master, she is sitting in the inner room."

Then the venerable Udāyin approached this girl, and having approached her, he sat down together with that girl, a man and a woman, in a secret place on a secluded, convenient seat,[1] conversing at the right time, speaking dhamma at the right time.[2]

Now at that time Visākhā, Migāra's mother, had many children and many grandchildren.[3] The children were

---

[1] *Old Comy.*, see below, p. 333, and *VA.* 631-632 explain that this means a seat where "it is possible to indulge in sexual intercourse."

[2] *VA.* 631, "talking for a time when anyone comes and goes in their presence, then he says: 'You should perform a seeming observance-day, you should give food to be distributed by ticket.'"

[3] *VA.* 631, "they say that she had ten sons and ten daughters . . . and that her sons and her daughters each had twenty children, so that in addition to her own, she had four hundred children."

healthy and the grandchildren were healthy and she was considered to be auspicious.[1] People used to regale Visākhā first at sacrifices, festivals[2] and feasts.[3] So Visākhā, being invited, went to that family. Visākhā saw the venerable Udāyin sitting together with that girl, a man and a woman,[4] in a secret place on a secluded, convenient seat. Seeing this, she said to the venerable Udāyin:

"This is not proper, honoured sir, it is not suitable that the master should sit together with women-folk, a man and a woman, in a secret place on a secluded, convenient seat. [187] Although, honoured sir, the master has no desire for that thing,[5] unbelieving people are difficult to convince."[6]

But the venerable Udāyin took no heed after he had been spoken to thus by Visākhā. Then Visākhā, when she had departed, told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks became annoyed, vexed, angry and said:

"How can the venerable Udāyin sit together with womenfolk, a man and a woman, in a secret place on a secluded, convenient seat?" And these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, Udāyin, that you sat together with womenfolk, a man and a woman, in a secret place on a secluded, convenient seat?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, sit together with womenfolk, a man with a woman, in a secret place on a secluded, convenient seat? It is not, foolish man, for the benefit of unbelievers . . . And thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should sit down together with a

---

[1] *Abhimaṅgalasammatā.*

[2] *VA.* 631, "The blessings of leading the bride to one's own home and away from her own home"—*i.e.*, wedding feasts.

[3] Feasts at the beginning and at the end of the rains.

[4] *Eko ekāya.*

[5] *Tena dhammena.*

[6] *I.e.*, that he and the woman were on purely platonic terms.

woman, the one with the other, in a secret place on a secluded, convenient seat, and if a trustworthy[1] woman lay-follower seeing him should speak concerning a certain one of three matters: either one involving defeat,[2] or one entailing a formal meeting of the Order,[3] or one involving expiation,[4] and the monk himself acknowledging that he was sitting down, should be dealt with according to a certain one of three matters: as to whether it is one involving defeat, or as to whether it is one entailing a formal meeting of the Order, or as to whether it is one involving expiation. Or that monk should be dealt with according to what that trustworthy woman lay-follower should say. This is an undetermined matter."[5] || **1** ||

Whatever means: he who . . .

Monk means: this is how monk is to be understood in this sense.

Woman means: a human woman, not a female yakkha, not a female departed one, not a female animal, even a girl born on this very day, much more an older one.[6]

Together with means: together.[7]

A man with a woman[8] means: there is a monk and also a woman.

A secret place means: secret from the eye, secret from the ear. Secret from the eye means: if covering the eye or raising the eyebrow or raising the head he is unable to see. Secret from the ear means: he is unable to hear ordinary speech.

A secluded seat means: it is secluded by a wall built of wattle and daub, or by a door or [**188**] by a screen or by a screen-wall or by a tree or by a pillar or by a sack or it is concealed by anything whatever.[9]

---

[1] *VA*. 632, " one who has attained the fruit of stream-entry."

[2] The First Defeat.

[3] The Second Formal Meeting.

[4] Pāc. 44, 45.

[5] It depends upon circumstances.

[6] = above, p. 202.

[7] =above, p. 202.

[8] Lit. one (masc.) with one (fem.).

[9] *Cf.* Undetermined II. 2, 1 and *Vin.* iv. 269.

Convenient means: it is possible to indulge in sexual intercourse.

Should sit down means: when the woman is sitting the monk is sitting or lying close to her; when the monk is sitting the woman is sitting or lying close to him; both are sitting, or both are lying.

Trustworthy means: (a woman who) has attained the fruit,[1] one who possesses complete understanding,[2] one who has learned the teaching.

Female lay-follower means: one going to the enlightened one for refuge, one going to dhamma for refuge, one going to the Order for refuge.

Seeing means: seeing.[3] || 1 ||

Should speak concerning a certain one of three matters: either one involving defeat, or one entailing a formal meeting of the Order, or one involving expiation, and the monk himself acknowledging that he was sitting down, should be dealt with according to a certain one of three matters: as to whether it is one involving defeat, or as to whether it is one entailing a formal meeting of the Order, or as to whether it is one involving expiation. Or that monk should be dealt with according to what that trustworthy woman lay-follower should say.

If she should say this: "The master was seen by me sitting and indulging in sexual intercourse with a woman," and if he acknowledges this, he should be dealt with for an offence.

If she should say this: "The master was seen by me sitting and indulging in sexual intercourse with a woman," and if he should say this: "It is true that I was sitting but I was not indulging in sexual intercourse," he should be dealt with for sitting down.

If she should say this: "The master was seen by me sitting and indulging in sexual intercourse with a woman," and if he should say this: "I was not sitting

[1] Of stream-attainment, *VA*. 632.

[2] *VA*. 632, "one who has penetrated the four truths."

[3] *disvâ ti passitvā*.

but I was lying down," he should be dealt with for lying down.

If she should say this: " The master was seen by me sitting and indulging in sexual intercourse with a woman," and if he should say this: " I was not sitting but I was standing," he is not to be dealt with.

If she should say this: " The master was seen by me lying down and indulging in sexual intercourse with a woman," if he acknowledges this, he should be dealt with for an offence.

If she should say this: " The master was seen . . . with a woman," and he should say this: " It is true that I was lying down but I was not indulging in sexual intercourse," he should be dealt with for lying down.

If she should say this: " The master . . . with a woman," and if he should say this: " I was not lying down but I was sitting," he should be dealt with for sitting down.

If she should say this: " The master . . . [189] with a woman," and he should say this: " I was not lying down but I was standing," he should not be dealt with.

If she should say this: " The master was seen by me sitting together with a woman and indulging in physical contact," and if he acknowledges this he should be dealt with for an offence. . . . " It is true that I was sitting, but I did not indulge in physical contact," he should be dealt with for sitting down . . . " I was not sitting, but I was lying down," he should be dealt with for lying down. . . . " I was not sitting but I was standing," he should not be dealt with.

If she should say this: " The master was seen by me lying down together with a woman and indulging in physical contact," and if he acknowledges this he should be dealt with for an offence . . . " It is true that I was lying down, but I did not indulge in physical contact," he should be dealt with for lying down. . . . " I was not lying down but I was sitting down" . . . " I was not lying down, I was standing," he should not be dealt with.

If she should say this: " The master was seen by me sitting together with a woman, the one with the other, in a secret place on a secluded seat suitable (for sexual intercourse)," and if he acknowledges this he should be dealt with for sitting down . . . " I was not sitting down, but I was lying down," he should be dealt with for lying down . . . " I was not sitting down, I was standing," he should not be dealt with.

If she should say this: " The master was seen by me lying down . . . on a secluded seat suitable (for sexual intercourse),"

and if he acknowledges this he should be dealt with for lying down. . . . "I was not lying down, I was sitting down," he should be dealt with for sitting down . . . "I was not lying down, I was standing," he should not be dealt with.

Undetermined means: not determined as to whether it involves defeat, or formal meeting of the Order, or expiation. ||2||**2**||

He acknowledges going,[1] he acknowledges sitting down, he acknowledges an offence,[2] he should be dealt with for an offence.[3] He acknowledges going, he does not acknowledge sitting down, but he acknowledges an offence, he should be dealt with for an offence. He acknowledges going, he acknowledges sitting down, but he does not acknowledge an offence, he should be dealt with for sitting down. He acknowledges going, he does not acknowledge sitting down and he does not acknowledge an offence, he should not be dealt with. He does not acknowledge going, but he acknowledges sitting down and he acknowledges an offence, he should be dealt with for an offence. He does not acknowledge going, he does not acknowledge sitting down, [**190**] but he acknowledges an offence, he should be dealt with for an offence. He does not acknowledge going, but he acknowledges sitting down, though he does not acknowledge an offence, he should be dealt with for sitting down. He does not acknowledge going, he does not acknowledge sitting down, he does not acknowledge an offence, he should not be dealt with. ||**3**||

Told is the First Undetermined Offence

---

[1] *VA.* 633, "saying: 'I am going to a secret place for the sake of sitting down.'"

[2] *VA.* 633, "a certain offence among the three"—*i.e.*, either a pārājika or a saṅghâdisesa or a pācittiya.

[3] *VA.* 633, *āpattiyā kāretabbo*, "he should be dealt with according to which of the three he acknowledges."

UNDETERMINED (ANIYATA) II

At one time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's park. At that time the venerable Udāyin said: "It has been forbidden by the lord to sit together with womenfolk, a man and a woman, in a secret place on a secluded, convenient seat," but he sat together with that young girl, the one with the other, in a secret place, conversing at the right time, talking dhamma at the right time. A second time did Visākhā, Migāra's mother, being invited, come to that family. Visākhā saw the venerable Udāyin sitting together with that girl, the one with the other, in a secret place, and seeing them she said to the venerable Udāyin:

"This, honoured sir, is not right, it is not suitable for the master to sit together with womenfolk, a man and a woman, in a secret place. Although, honoured sir, the master has no desire for that thing, unbelieving people are difficult to convince."

But the venerable Udāyin took no heed after he had been spoken to thus by Visākhā. Then Visākhā, when she had departed, told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks . . . (=Undetermined I. **1**; *the words* on a secluded, convenient seat *are omitted here*) . . . "And thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

And furthermore, if there is not a seat which is secluded and convenient, but sufficiently so[1] for speaking to a woman with lewd words,[2] then whatever monk should sit down on such a seat together with a woman,

[1] *Alaṃ*. [2] *Cf.* Formal Meeting III.

the one with the other, in a secret place, and a trustworthy woman lay-follower seeing him should speak concerning a certain one of two matters: either one entailing a formal meeting of the Order, or one involving expiation, and the monk himself acknowledging that he was sitting down, should be dealt with according to a certain one of two matters: as to whether it is one entailing a formal meeting of the Order, or as to whether it is one involving expiation. Or [**191**] that monk should be dealt with according to what that trustworthy woman lay-follower should say. This again is an undetermined matter." || **1** ||

And furthermore, if there is not a seat which is secluded means: it is not secluded by a wall built of wattle and daub or by a door or by a screen or by a screen wall or by a tree or by a pillar or by a sack, or it is not secluded by anything whatever.[1]

Not convenient means: it is not possible to indulge in sexual intercourse.[2]

But sufficiently so for speaking to a woman with lewd words means: it is possible to speak to a woman with lewd words.

Whatever means: he who.

Monk means: . . . this is the sense in which monk is to be understood.

On such a seat means: on a seat like that.

Woman means: a human woman, not a female yakkha, not a female departed one, not a female animal,[2] one who is learned and competent to know good and bad speech, and what is lewd and what is not lewd.[3]

Together with means: together.[2]

Should sit down means: when the woman is sitting . . .[2]

Seeing means: seeing.[2] || 1 ||

---

[1] *Cf.* Undetermined I. 2, 1 and *Vin.* iv. 269.

[2] *Cf.* Undetermined I. 2, 1.

[3] =above, p. 215.

Should speak concerning a certain one of two matters: either one entailing a formal meeting of the Order, or one involving expiation, and the monk himself acknowledging that he was sitting down, should be dealt with according to a certain one of two matters: as to whether it is one entailing a formal meeting of the Order, or as to whether it is one involving expiation. Or that monk should be dealt with according to what that trustworthy woman lay-follower should say.

If she should say this: "The master was seen by me when he was sitting down and coming into[1] physical contact with a woman," if he acknowledges this he should be dealt with for an offence.

If she should say this: "The master was seen by me . . . physical contact," and if he should say: "It is true that I was sitting, but I did not come into physical contact," he should be dealt with for sitting. . . . "I was not sitting, but I was lying down," he should be dealt with for lying down. . . . "I was not sitting, but I was standing," he should not be dealt with.

If she should say this: "The master was seen by me lying down, and coming into physical contact with a woman," if he acknowledges this he should be dealt with for an offence. . . . "It is true that I was lying down, but I did not come into physical contact," he should be dealt with for lying down. . . . "I was not lying down, but I was sitting down," [192] he should be dealt with for sitting down. . . . "I was not lying down, but I was standing," he should not be dealt with.

If she should say this: "The master was heard by me when he was sitting down and speaking lewd words to a woman," if he acknowledges this he should be dealt with for an offence.

If she should say this: "The master . . . to a woman," and if he should say: "It is true that I was sitting down but I did not speak lewd words to a woman," he should be dealt with for sitting down. . . . "I was not sitting down but I was lying down," he should be dealt with for lying down. . . . "I was not sitting down but I was standing," he should not be dealt with.

[1] *Samāpajjanto.* On *samāpajjati*, see above, p. 201, n. 3.

If she should say this: " The master was heard . . . as he was lying down and speaking lewd words to a woman " . . . " but I was standing," he should not be dealt with.

If she should say this: " The master was seen by me sitting together with a woman, the one with the other, in a secret place," and if he acknowledges this he should be dealt with for sitting down. . . . " I was not sitting down, but I was lying down," he should be dealt with for lying down. . . . " I was not sitting down, but I was standing," he should not be dealt with.

If she should say this: " The master was seen by me lying down together with a woman, the one with the other, in a secret place," and if he acknowledges this, he should be dealt with for lying down. . . . " I was not lying down, but I was sitting down," he should be dealt with for sitting down. . . . " I was not sitting down, but I was standing," he should not be dealt with.

This again means: it is called so with reference to the former.

Undetermined means: not determined as to whether it involves a formal meeting of the Order, or expiation. ||2||**2**||

He acknowledges going, he acknowledges sitting down, he acknowledges an offence, he should be dealt with for an offence. He acknowledges going, he does not acknowledge sitting down, he acknowledges an offence, he should be dealt with for an offence. He acknowledges going, he acknowledges sitting down, he does not acknowledge an offence, he should be dealt with for sitting down. He acknowledges going, he does not acknowledge sitting down, he does not acknowledge an offence, he should not be dealt with. He does not acknowledge going, he acknowledges sitting down, he acknowledges an offence, he should be dealt with for an offence. He does not acknowledge going, he does not acknowledge sitting down, but he acknowledges an offence, he should be dealt with for an offence. He does not acknowledge going, he acknowledges sitting, he does not acknowledge an offence, he should be dealt with for sitting down. He does not acknowledge going, he does not acknowledge sitting down, he does not acknowledge an offence, he should not be dealt with.[1] ||**3**||

Told is the Second Undetermined Offence [**193**]

[1] *Cf.* above, Undetermined I. **3.**

Set forth, venerable ones, are the two undetermined matters. In this connection I ask the venerable ones: I hope that you are pure in this matter? A second time I ask: I hope that you are pure in this matter? A third time I ask: I hope that you are pure in this matter? The venerable ones are pure in this matter, therefore they are silent. Thus do I understand.

Its summary:

Convenient and so and likewise, but not thus,
Such undetermined matters are well pointed out by the best of buddhas.

Told is the Undetermined

APPENDIX OF UNTRANSLATED PASSAGES[1]

Page 38[14] . . . makkaṭiṃ āmisena upalāpetvā tassā methunaṃ dhammaṃ paṭisevati . . .

Page 38[20] . . . upasaṃkamitvā tesaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ purato kaṭiṃ pi cālesi cheppaṃ pi cālesi kaṭiṃ pi oḍḍi nimittaṃ pi akāsi. . . .

Page 39[1] . . . so bhikkhu imissā makkaṭiyā methunaṃ dhammaṃ paṭisevatî ti.

Page 39[5] . . . sā makkaṭī taṃ piṇḍaṃ bhuñjitvā tassa bhikkhuno kaṭiṃ oḍḍi . . .

Page 39[9] . . . makkaṭiyā methunaṃ dhammaṃ paṭisevasî ti . . .

Page 39[33] . . . makkaṭiyā methunaṃ dhammaṃ paṭisevî ti . . .

Page 48[21] . . . vaccamagge passāvamagge mukhe . . .

Page 48[25, 28] . . . vaccamagge mukhe . . .

Page 48[31], 49[3] . . . vaccamaggaṃ—pa—passāvamaggaṃ—pa—mukhaṃ . . .

Page 49[9, 38] . . . vaccamaggena—pa—passāvamaggena—pa—mukhena . . .

Page 49[27] Mataṃ yebhuyyena khayitaṃ bhikkhussa santike ānetvā vaccamaggena—pa—passāvamaggena—pa—mukhena aṅgajātaṃ abhinisīdenti . . .

Page 52[5] . . . methunaṃ dhammaṃ paṭisevi.

Page 53[10] . . . aṅguṭṭhaṃ aṅgajātaṃ pavesesi . . .

Page 55[11] . . . attano aṅgajātaṃ mukhena aggahesi.

Page 55[15] . . . attano aṅgajātaṃ attano vaccamaggaṃ pavesesi . . .

Page 55[19] . . . aṅgajātasāmantā vaṇo hoti. So evaṃ me anāpatti bhavissatî ti aṅgajāte aṅgajātaṃ pavesetvā vaṇena nīhari . . .

Page 55[23] (as p. 55[19]) . . . bhavissatî ti vaṇe aṅgajātaṃ pavesetvā aṅgajātena nīhari . . .

Page 55 [24, 29] . . . nimittaṃ aṅgajātena chupi . . .

---

[1] See Introduction, p. xxxvii.

Page 56[6] . . . mukhena aṅgajātaṃ aggahesi . . .

Page 56[29] . . . abbhantaraṃ ghaṭṭetvā bahi mocehi—pa—bahi ghaṭṭetvā abbhantaraṃ mocehi. . . .

Page 57[11, 16] . . . vattakate mukhe chupantaṃ (*l.* 16 ac°) aṅgajātaṃ pavesesi . . .

Page 57[23] . . . nimitte aṅgajātaṃ paṭipādesi. . . .
Page 58[17], 59[5], 60[7] aṅgajāte abhinisīditvā . . .

Page 58[20] pañcahi bhikkhave ākārehi aṅgajātaṃ kammaṇiyaṃ hoti: rāgena, vaccena, passāvena, vātena, uccāliṅgapāṇakadaṭṭhena. Imehi kho bhikkhave pañcah' ākārehi aṅgajātaṃ kammaṇiyaṃ hoti. Aṭṭhānaṃ etaṃ bhikkhave anavakāso yaṃ tassa bhikkhuno rāgena aṅgajātaṃ kammaṇiyaṃ assa. . . .

Page 58[25], 59[1, 17, 25], 62[23] . . . aṅgajāte abhinisīdi . . .
Page 61[16, 30] . . . mocessāmi . . .
Page 62[31] . . . migapotako tassa passāvaṭṭhānaṃ āgantvā passāvaṃ pivanto mukhena aṅgajātaṃ aggahesi. So bhikkhu sādiyi . . .

Page 196[14] . . . dasa sukkāni, nīlaṃ pītakaṃ lohitakaṃ odātaṃ takkavaṇṇaṃ dakavaṇṇaṃ telavaṇṇaṃ khīravaṇṇaṃ dadhivaṇṇaṃ sappivaṇṇaṃ.

Page 197[8] Ajjhattarūpe moceti, bahiddhārūpe moceti, ajjhattabahiddhārūpe moceti, ākāse kaṭiṃ kampento moceti, rāgupatthambhe moceti, vaccupatthambhe moceti, passāvupatthambhe moceti, vātupatthambhe moceti, uccāliṅgapāṇakadaṭṭhupatthambhe moceti, ārogatthāya moceti, sukhatthāya moceti, bhesajjatthāya moceti, dānatthāya moceti, [112] puññatthāya moceti, yaññatthāya moceti, saggatthāya moceti, bījatthāya moceti, vīmaṃsatthāya moceti, davatthāya moceti. Nīlaṃ moceti, pītakaṃ moceti, lohitakaṃ moceti, odātaṃ moceti, takkavaṇṇaṃ moceti, dakavaṇṇaṃ moceti, telavaṇṇaṃ moceti, khīravaṇṇaṃ moceti, dadhivaṇṇaṃ moceti, sappivaṇṇaṃ moceti. || 1 ||
Ajjhattarūpe 'ti ajjhattaṃ upādinnarūpe.
Bahiddhārūpe 'ti bahiddhā upādinne vā anupādinne vā.
Ajjhattabahiddhārūpe 'ti tadubhaye.
Ākāse kaṭiṃ kampento 'ti ākāse vāyamantassa aṅgajātaṃ kammaṇiyaṃ hoti.
Rāgupatthambhe 'ti rāgena pīḷitassa aṅgajātaṃ kammaṇiyaṃ hoti.
Vaccupatthambhe 'ti vaccena pīḷitassa aṅgajātaṃ kammaniyam hoti.

Passāvupatthambhe 'ti passāvena pīḷitassa aṅgajātaṃ kammaṇiyaṃ hoti.

Vātupatthambhe 'ti vātena pīḷitassa aṅgajātaṃ kammaṇiyaṃ hoti.

Uccāliṅgapāṇakadaṭṭhupatthambhe 'ti uccāliṅgapāṇakadaṭṭhena aṅgajātaṃ kammaṇiyaṃ hoti.

Ārogyatthāyâ 'ti ārogo bhavissāmi; sukhatthāyâ 'ti sukhaṃ vedanaṃ uppādessāmi; bhesajjatthāyâ 'ti bhesajjaṃ bhavissati; dānatthāyâ 'ti dānaṃ dassāmi; puññatthāyâ 'ti puññaṃ bhavissati; yaññatthāyâ 'ti yaññaṃ yajissāmi; saggatthāyâ 'ti saggaṃ gamissāmi; bījatthāyâ 'ti bījaṃ bhavissati.

Vīmaṃsatthāyâ 'ti nīlaṃ bhavissati pītakaṃ bhavissati . . . sappivaṇṇaṃ bhavissati.

Davatthāyâ 'ti khiḍḍâdhippāyo. || 2 ||

Ajjhattarūpe ceteti upakkamati muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa. Bahiddhārūpe ceteti . . . āpatti saṅghâdisesassa. Ajjhattabahiddhārūpe ceteti . . . .āpatti saṅghâdisesassa. Ākāse kaṭiṃ kampento ceteti . . . āpatti saṅghâdisesassa. Rāgupatthambhe ceteti . . . vaccupatthambhe . . . davatthāya ceteti upakkamati muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa.

Nīlaṃ ceteti upakkamati muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa. Pītakaṃ . . . sappivaṇṇaṃ ceteti . . . āpatti saṅghâdisesassa.

Suddhikaṃ niṭṭhitaṃ. || 3 || [**113**]

Ārogyatthañ ca sukhatthañ ca ceteti . . . āpatti saṅghâdisesassa. Ārogyatthañ ca bhesajjatthañ ca—pa—ārogyatthañ ca dānatthañ ca—pa—ārogyatthañ ca puññatthañ ca—pa—arogyatthañ ca yaññatthañ ca—pa—ārogyatthañ ca saggatthañ ca—pa—ārogyatthañ ca bījatthañ ca—pa—ārogyatthañ ca vīmaṃsatthañ ca—pa—ārogyatthañ ca davatthañ ca ceteti upakkamati muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa.

Ekamūlakassa khaṇḍacakkaṃ niṭṭhitaṃ. || 4 ||

Sukhatthañ ca bhesajjatthañ ca ceteti . . . āpatti saṅghâdisesassa. Sukhatthañ ca dānatthañ ca . . . sukhatthañ ca davatthañ ca ceteti . . . āpatti saṅghâdisesassa. Sukhatthañ ca ārogyatthañ ca ceteti . . . āpatti sanghâdisesassa.

Bhesajjatthañ ca dānatthañ ca . . . ; davatthañ ca vīmamsatthañ ca ceteti . . .. āpatti saṅghâdisesassa.

Ekamūlakassa baddhacakkaṃ niṭṭhitaṃ.

Dumūlakâdi pi evam eva netabbaṃ.

Ārogyatthañ ca sukhatthañ ca bhesajjatthañ ca . . . davatthañ ca ceteti upakkamati muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa.

Sabbamūlakaṃ niṭṭhitaṃ. || 5 ||

Nīlañ ca pītakañ ca ceteti upakkamati muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa, . . . nīlañ ca sappivaṇṇañ ca ceteti upakkamati muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa.

Ekamūlakassa khaṇḍacakkaṃ niṭṭhitaṃ.
Pītakañ ca lohitakañ ca . . . sappivaṇṇañ ca dadhivaṇṇañ ca ceteti upakkamati muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa.
Ekamūlakassa baddhacakkaṃ niṭṭhitaṃ.
Dumūlakâdi pi evam eva netabbaṃ.
Nīlañ ca pītakañ ca lohitakañ ca . . . sappivaṇṇañ ca ceteti upakkamati muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa.
Sabbamūlakaṃ niṭṭhitaṃ. || 6 ||
Ārogyatthañ ca nīlañ ca ceteti upakkamati muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa.
Ārogyatthañ ca sukhatthañ ca nīlañ ca pītakañ ca ceteti upakkamati muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa.
Ārogyatthañ ca sukhatthañ ca bhesajjatthañ ca nīlañ ca pītakañ ca lohitakañ ca ceteti upakkamati muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa.
Evam eva ubhato vaḍḍhetabbaṃ. [114]
Ārogyatthañ ca sukhatthañ ca bhesajjatthañ ca . . . davatthañ ca nīlañ ca pītakañ ca . . . sappivaṇṇañ ca ceteti upakkamati muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa.
Missakacakkaṃ niṭṭhitaṃ. || 7 ||
Nīlaṃ mocessāmî ti ceteti upakkamati, pītakaṃ muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa. Nīlaṃ mocessāmî ti ceteti upakkamati, lohitakaṃ . . . sappivaṇṇaṃ muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa.
Khaṇḍacakkaṃ.
Pītakaṃ mocessāmî ti ceteti upakkamati, lohitakaṃ muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa. Pītakaṃ mocessāmî ti ceteti upakkamati, odātaṃ . . . sappivaṇṇaṃ—pa—nīlam muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa.
Baddhacakkaṃ mūlaṃ saṃkhittaṃ.
Sappivaṇṇaṃ mocessāmî ti ceteti upakkamati, nīlaṃ muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa. Sappivaṇṇaṃ mocessāmî ti ceteti upakkamati, dadhivaṇṇaṃ muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa.
Kucchicakkaṃ. || 8 ||
Pītakaṃ mocessāmî ti ceteti upakkamati, nīlaṃ muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa. Lohitakaṃ mocessāmî ti ceteti upakkamati, nīlaṃ muccati—pa—odātaṃ mocessāmî ti ceteti upakkamati, nīlaṃ muccati . . . sappivaṇṇaṃ mocessāmî ti ceteti upakkamati, nīlaṃ muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa.
Piṭṭhicakkassa paṭhamaṃ gamanaṃ.
Lohitakaṃ mocessāmî ti ceteti upakkamati, pītakaṃ muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa. Odātaṃ . . . sappivaṇṇaṃ—pa—nīlaṃ mocessāmî ti ceteti upakkamati, pītakaṃ muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa.
Piṭṭhicakkassa dutiyaṃ gamanaṃ niṭṭhitaṃ.
Odātaṃ mocessāmî ti ceteti upakkamati, lohitakaṃ muccati

. . . pītakaṃ mocessāmî ti ceteti upakkamati, lohitakaṃ muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa.

Piṭṭhicakkassa tatiyaṃ gamanaṃ.

. . . . .

Nīlaṃ mocessāmî ti ceteti upakkamati, sappivaṇṇaṃ muccati . . . dadhivaṇṇaṃ mocessāmî ti ceteti upakkamati, sappivaṇṇaṃ muccati, āpatti saṅghâdisesassa.

Piṭṭhicakkassa dasamaṃ gamanaṃ. Piṭṭhicakkapeyyālo niṭṭhito. || 9 || 3 ||

Page 198[3] Teṅa kho pana samayena aññatarassa bhikkhuno uccāraṃ karontassa asuci mucci. Tassa kukkuccaṃ ahosi. Bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesi. Kiṃcitto tvaṃ bhikkhû 'ti. Nâham bhagavā mocanâdhippāyo ti. Anāpatti bhikkhu na mocanâdhippāyassâ ti. T.k.p.s. aññatarassa bhikkhuno passāvaṃ karontassa . . . anāpatti bhikkhu na mocanâdhippāyassâ ti. || 2 || T.k.p.s.a.b. kāmavitakkaṃ vitakkentassa asuci mucci. Tassa kukkuccaṃ ahosi—la—anāpatti bhikkhu vitakkentassâ ti. || 3 ||
Tena kho pana samayena aññatarassa bhikkhuno uṇhodakena nhāyantassa asuci mucci. Tassa kukkuccaṃ ahosi—la—kiṃcitto tvaṃ bhikkhû ti. Nâhaṃ bhagavā mocanâdhippāyo ti. Anāpatti bhikkhu na mocanâdhippāyassâ ti. T.k.p.s.a.b. mocanâdhippāyassa uṇhodakena nhāyantassa asuci mucci. Tassa [116] kukkuccaṃ ahosi—la—āpattiṃ tvaṃ bhikkhu āpanno saṅghâdisesan ti. T.k.p.s.a.b. mocanâdhippāyassa uṇhodakena nhāyantassa asuci na mucci. Tassa kukkuccaṃ ahosi —la—anāpatti bhikkhu saṅghâdisesassa, āpatti thullaccayassâ ti. || 4 || Tena kho pana samayena aññatarassa bhikkhuno aṅgajāte vaṇo hoti, bhesajjena ālimpantassa asuci mucci. Tassa kukkuccaṃ ahosi—la—anāpatti bhikkhu na mocanâdhippāyassâ ti. T.k.p.s.a.b. aṅgajāte vaṇo hoti, mocanâdhippāyassa bhesajjena ālimpantassa asuci mucci—pa—asuci na mucci. Tassa kukkuccaṃ ahosi—pa—anāpatti bhikkhu saṅghâdisesassa, āpatti thullaccayassâ ti. || 5 || Tena kho pana samayena aññatarassa bhikkhuno aṇḍaṃ kaṇḍuvantassa asuci mucci. Tassa kukkuccaṃ ahosi—la—anāpatti bhikkhu na mocanâdhippāyassâ ti. T.k.p.s.a.b. mocanâdhippāyassa aṇḍaṃ kaṇḍuvantassa asuci mucci—la—asuci na mucci. Tassa kukkuccaṃ ahosi—la—anāpatti bhikkhu saṅghâdisesassa, āpatti thullaccayassâ ti. || 6 || Tena kho pana samayena aññatarassa bhikkhuno maggaṃ gacchantassa asuci mucci. Tassa kukkuccaṃ ahosi—la—anāpatti bhikkhu na mocanâdhippāyassâ ti. T.k.p.s.a.b. mocanâdhippāyassa maggaṃ gacchantassa asuci mucci—la—asuci na mucci . . . thullaccayassâ ti. || 7 || Tena kho pana samayena

aññatarassa bhikkhuno vatthiṃ gahetvā passāvaṃ karontassa . . . aññatarassa bhikkhuno jantâghare udaravaṭṭim tāpentassa . . . aññatarassa bhikkhuno jantâghare upajjhāyassa piṭṭhiparikammaṃ karontassa . . . aññatarassa bhikkhuno ūruṃ ghaṭṭāpentassa . . . (*the same three cases as above*) . . . āpatti thullaccayassâ ti || 8 ||.

Tena kho pana samayena aññataro bhikkhu mocanâdhippāyo aññataraṃ sāmaṇeraṃ etad avoca: ehi me tvaṃ āvuso sāmaṇera aṅgajātaṃ gaṇhāhī ti. So tassa aṅgajātaṃ aggahesi, tassa asuci mucci. Tassa kukkuccaṃ ahosi—la—āpattiṃ tvaṃ bhikkhu āpanno saṅghâdisesan ti. T.k.p.s.a.b. suttassa sāmaṇerassa aṅgajātaṃ aggahesi. Tassa asuci mucci. Tassa kukkuccaṃ [117] ahosi—la—anāpatti bhikkhu saṅghâdhisesassa, āpatti dukkaṭassâ ti. || 9 ||

Tena kho pana samayena aññatarassa bhikkhuno mocanâdhippāyassa ūrūhi aṅgajātaṃ pīḷentassa asuci mucci—la—asuci na mucci. Tassa kukkuccaṃ . . . thullaccayassâ ti. T.k.p.s.a.b. mocanâdhippāyassa muṭṭhinā aṅgajātam pīḷentassa . . . mocanâdhippāyassa ākāse kaṭiṃ kampentassa asuci mucci —la—asuci na mucci. Tassa kukkuccaṃ . . . thullaccayassâ ti. || 10 || Tena kho pana samayena aññatarassa bhikkhuno kāyaṃ thambhentassa asuci mucci—la—asuci na mucci . . . thullaccayassâ ti. || 11 ||

Tena kho pana samayena aññataro bhikkhu sāratto mātugāmassa aṅgajātaṃ upanijjhāyi, tassa asuci mucci. Tassa kukkuccaṃ ahosi—la—anāpatti bhikkhu saṅghâdisesassa. Na ca bhikkhave sārattena mātugāmassa aṅgajātaṃ upanijjhāyitabbaṃ. Yo upanijjhāyeyya, āpatti dukaṭassâ ti. || 12 ||

Tena kho pana samayena aññatarassa bhikkhuno mocanâdhippāyassa tāḷacchiddaṃ aṅgajātaṃ pavesentassa asuci mucci—la—asuci na mucci. Tassa kukkuccaṃ ahosi—la—anāpatti bhikkhu saṅghâdisesassa, āpatti thullaccayassâ ti. || 13 ||

Tena kho pana samayena aññatarassa bhikkhuno mocanâdhippāyassa kaṭṭhena aṅgajātaṃ ghaṭṭentassa asuci mucci—la—asuci na mucci. Tassa kukkuccaṃ . . . thullaccayassâ ti. || 14 || Tena kho pana samayena aññatarassa bhikkhuno paṭisote nhāyantassa asuci . . . (*the three cases as above*) . . . thullaccayassâ ti. || 15 || T.k.p.s.a.b. udañjalaṃ kīḷantassa . . . aññatarassa bhikkhuno udake dhāvantassa . . . aññatarassa bhikkhuno pupphāvaḷiyaṃ kīḷantassa . . . aññatarassa bhikkhuno pokkharavane dhāvantassa asuci . . . (*three cases as above*) . . . thullaccayassâ ti. || 16 || T.k.p.s.a.b. mocanâdhippāyassa vālikaṃ aṅgajātaṃ pavesentassa asuci mucci—la—asuci na mucci. Tassa kukkuccaṃ . . . thullaccayassâ ti. T.k.p.s.a.b. mocanâdhippāyassa kaddamaṃ aṅgajātaṃ pavesentassa asuci mucci—la—asuci na [118] mucci. Tassa kukkuccaṃ

. . . thullaccayassâ ti. Tena kho pana samayena aññatarassa bhikkhuno udakena aṅgajātaṃ osiñcantassa asuci mucci . . . (*three cases as above*) . . . thullaccayassâ ti. T.k.p.s.a.b. mocanâdhippāyassa sayane aṅgajātaṃ ghaṭṭentassa asuci mucci —la—asuci na mucci. Tassa kukkuccaṃ . . . thullaccayassâ ti. T.k.p.s.a.b. mocanâdhippāyassa aṅguṭṭhena aṅgajātaṃ ghaṭṭentassa asuci mucci—la—asuci na mucci. Tassa kukkuccaṃ . . . thullaccayassâ ti. ||17 || **5** ||

Paṭhamasaṅghâdisesaṃ niṭṭhitaṃ.

INDEXES

I.—WORDS AND SUBJECTS

[References to words commented upon in the Old Commentary are printed in heavy type.]

II.—NAMES

III.—SOME PALI WORDS IN THE NOTES

IV.—TITLES OF WORKS ABBREVIATED IN FOOTNOTES

A. = Anguttara-Nikāya.
AA. = Commentary on A.
Asl. = Atthasālinī.
Chānd. = Chāndogya Upaniṣad.
C.H.I. = *Cambridge History of India.*
Comy. = Commentary.
Crit. Pali Dict. = *See* Tr. Crit. Pali Dict.
D. = Dīgha-Nikāya.
DA. = Commentary on D.
DhA. = Commentary on Dhp.
Dhp. = Dhammapada.
Dhs. = Dhammasaṅgaṇi.
Dial. = *Dialogues of the Buddha.*

Fur. Dial.=*Further Dialogues.*
G.S.=*Gradual Sayings.*
H.O.S.=*Harvard Oriental Series.*
It.=Itivuttaka.
ItA.=Commentary on It.
Jā.=Jātaka.
J.P.T.S.=*Journal of the Pali Text Society.*
K.S.=*Kindred Sayings.*
KhA., KhuA.=Commentary on Khuddakapāṭha.
Kvu.=Kathāvatthu.
M.=Majjhima-Nikāya.
MA.=Commentary on M.
Miln.=Milindapañha.
Nd.=Niddesa.
Pāc.=Pācittiya.
Pss. Breth.=*Psalms of the Brethren.*
Pss. Sisters=*Psalms of the Sisters.*
Pṭs.=Paṭisambhidāmagga.
Pts. Contr.=*Points of Controversy.*
P.T.S. Dict.=Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary (Rhys Davids and Stede).
Pug.=Puggalapaññati.
PvA.=Commentary on Petavatthu.
S.=Saŋyutta-Nikāya.
SA.=Commentary on S.
S.B.B.=*Sacred Books of the Buddhists.*
S.B.E.=*Sacred Books of the East.*
Sn.=Sutta-Nipāta.
SnA.=Commentary on Sn.
Tait. Up.=Taittirīya Upaniṣad.
Thag.=Theragāthā.
Thig.=Therīgāthā.
ThigA.=Commentary on Thig.
Tr. Crit. Pali Dict.=Critical Pali Dictionary (Dines Andersen and Helmer Smith).
Ud.=Udāna.
UdA.=Commentary on Ud.
Up.=Upaniṣad.
VA.=Commentary on Vin.
Vbh.=Vibhaṅga.
VbhA.=Commentary on Vbh.
Vin.=Vinaya.
Vin. Texts=*Vinaya Texts.*
Vism.=Visuddhimagga.
Vv.=Vimānavatthu.
VvA.=Commentary on Vv.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
LOWE AND BRYDONE PRINTERS LIMITED, LONDON, N.W.10